

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ESCH: Resolution of the California State Federation of Labor, in convention assembled at San Diego, Cal., October 9, 1918, indorsing the McKellar-Keating bill and urging its favorable consideration by Congress; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of Dean L. Moberley, of Streator, Ill., and Robert L. McGuire, of Earlville, Ill., protesting against tax on brokers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial adopted at a mass meeting of the citizens of Peru and La Salle, Ill., for the freedom and independence of Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Resolution of the Associated Industries of Massachusetts urging amendment of the Federal tax law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TAGUE: Memorial of Division No. 72, Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, of Boston, Mass., regarding home rule for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Resolution of Division No. 72, Ancient Order of Hibernians in America, urging independence for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VARE: Resolutions of Rotary Club of Philadelphia for retirement of superannuated civil Government employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, December 10, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our great military leaders on the field of battle have recognized Thy grace to us as a people. Thy mighty arm has gained us victory, and in this place of political power, where we shape the policies of a nation, we would no less recognize Thy right to rule and our dependence upon Thy grace and Thy power. A mighty task, unspeakable in its greatness, the greatest that has ever faced, perhaps, organized society, lies just before us. Oh, do Thou give us grace, Almighty God, to meet the issues of our day and to triumph by our dependence upon Thee and by Thy divine guidance in all that pertains to the happiness and prosperity of the world. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, December 6, 1918, was read and approved.

SENATOR FROM OREGON.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I present the credentials of my colleague, Hon. FRED W. MULKEY, who has been elected for the short term by the people of Oregon as Senator. I ask that the credentials may be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The credentials will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

STATE OF OREGON,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT.

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

Know ye, that it appearing from the official canvass of the vote cast at the general election held within and for the State of Oregon on Tuesday, the 5th day of November, A. D. 1918, that FRED W. MULKEY, of Multnomah County, State of Oregon, received the highest number of votes cast for the office of United States Senator in Congress at said general election:

Now, therefore, I, James Withycombe, governor of the State of Oregon, by virtue of the authority vested in me under the laws of the State of Oregon, do hereby grant this certificate of election and declare said FRED W. MULKEY, of Multnomah County, State of Oregon, to be duly elected to the office of United States Senator in Congress of the State of Oregon for the term of ----- to fill the vacancy in term ending March 4, 1919.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the State of Oregon to be hereunto affixed.

Done at the Capitol, at Salem, Oreg., this 30th day of November, A. D. 1918.

JAMES WITHYCOMBE, Governor.

By the governor:
[SEAL.]

BEN W. OLCOTT,
Secretary of State.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the credentials? The Chair hears none, and they will be placed on file.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I ask that the oath be administered to Mr. MULKEY, who is present.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The newly elected Senator will present himself at the desk for the purpose of taking the oath of office.

Mr. MULKEY was escorted to the Vice President's desk by Mr. CHAMBERLAIN, and the oath prescribed by law having been administered to him he took his seat in the Senate.

SENATOR FROM IDAHO.

Mr. NUGENT. Mr. President, I present the credentials of my colleague, Hon. WILLIAM E. BORAH, which I ask to have read and placed on file.

The credentials were read and ordered to be filed, as follows:

STATE OF IDAHO—CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION.

To all to whom these presents shall come, greeting:

Whereas the Board of Canvassers of the State of Idaho, as provided in section 453 of the Revised Codes, having duly canvassed, declared, and certified on the 25th day of November, A. D. 1918, to the secretary of state that at a general election held in said State on the 5th day of November, A. D. 1918, WILLIAM E. BORAH received the greatest number of legal votes cast at said election for the office of United States Senator and is therefore elected to such office.

Now, therefore, I, W. T. Dougherty, secretary of state of the State of Idaho, do certify that WILLIAM E. BORAH is elected to the office of United States Senator in and for the State of Idaho for the period of six years commencing the 4th day of March, A. D. 1919, and ending the 4th day of March, A. D. 1925, as appears by the records in my office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of Idaho. Done at Boise, the capital of said State, this 25th day of November, in the year of our Lord 1918, and of the independence of the United States of America the one hundred and forty-third.

[SEAL.]

W. T. DOUGHERTY,
Secretary of State.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The Judiciary Committee, by direction of the Senate, is investigating the subject of German propaganda work in this country during the war. On Saturday before that committee certain evidence was produced by Mr. Bielaski and my name was so referred to as to justify me in making a brief comment.

The evidence in question consisted of a letter dated July 22, 1915, signed "Reiswitz," and sent to some one whom he addressed as "Your Excellency." We are told that Reiswitz was then the German consul at Chicago. His letter appears to give the so-called "excellency" information concerning a German movement in this country to stop the export of arms and ammunition. This movement was known as the Embargo Conference. In this letter Reiswitz mentions my name in the following paragraph:

Among others, the following have agreed to cooperate: Senator HITCHCOCK, Congressman Buchanan, William Bayard Hale, of New York, and the well-known pulpit orator, Dr. Aked (born an Englishman), from San Francisco.

Hitchcock seems to be very strong for the plan. He told our representative at a conference in Omaha, "If this matter is organized in the right way, you will sweep the United States."

If his alleged "excellency" or Reiswitz himself had any intelligence, either or both of them must have known that I was myself the author of the bill to prohibit the export of arms and ammunition and that I had introduced it in the Senate more than eight months before the Reiswitz letter was written. They must have known that I had made a Senate speech upon it and that it had been debated in the Senate and discussed in the newspapers. They must have known that on February 17, 1915, I had offered my bill as an amendment to the shipping bill then pending and that my amendment had been defeated by a vote of 36 to 51. My position, therefore, in favor of prohibiting the export of arms and ammunition had been independently and publicly taken and was widely known months before Reiswitz discovered it and revealed it to his chief as a secret.

The part I took during 1914 and 1915 in favor of prohibiting the export of arms and ammunition during our neutrality has never been a subject of concealment or apology on my part. It became a campaign issue in 1916 when I ran for reelection, and the fact that I was reelected by a comfortable majority indicates that my course and my motives were understood and approved by the people of Nebraska.

My stand was taken in 1914 as an American for neutrality. The Germans in America took theirs by forming the Embargo Conference in 1915 as partisans of Germany. They were supporting my bill, but I declined to go to their conferences, conventions, or meetings, though I was often invited to appear as a speaker. I made my only speeches here in the Senate or in defending my course later before my constituents.

In those days, Mr. President, the country was under a pledge of neutrality by virtue of the President's proclamation made when the war broke out. We should, no doubt, have remained neutral, at least nominally and officially, if Germany had not by a series of outrages made our attitude first difficult and then impossible.

My attitude naturally changed with changing conditions.

I stood, first, for a strict, peaceful, and impartial neutrality even to the extent of selling no arms and ammunition and lending no money to either side.

Next, when Germany began a systematic attack on our commerce, I was ready to fight to protect our neutrality.

I supported the President's request that we authorize him to assert and protect our neutrality by arming our merchant ships, and I had charge in the Senate of what was known as the armed neutrality resolution, which died so dramatically here in the Senate at noon on March 4, 1917.

A month later, when the issue changed from armed neutrality to war, I had charge of the declaration of war, which was briefly debated and passed by the Senate April 4, 1917.

And so, Mr. President, like other Americans, I have passed from one phase of the situation to another—peaceful neutrality, armed neutrality, war. German conduct forced these changes not only in the case of public men as individuals but in the case of the country as a whole. This conduct was not wholly confined to the outrages perpetrated upon the high seas and in the war areas in Europe, but it included the criminal folly of German agents, whom Mr. Bielaski has been investigating. The latter exasperated American patience at home while German atrocities abroad aroused American resentment.

I have no disposition to criticize Mr. Bielaski for revealing all the secret correspondence of these German agents and conspirators with each other. It is evident, however, that they in correspondence with each other have used the names of a number of public men recklessly if not falsely. They reached the climax of absurdity when they recorded Prof. Albert B. Hart, of Harvard, as one of the public men of America who would cooperate with them.

In my case they knew that I had refused to join their organization, refused to speak at their meetings, or even to attend them, though they were camouflaged as American.

I supported in the days of our neutrality the embargo idea as a Senator, as the publisher of a large newspaper, and as an American, but I declined to associate myself with those who became partisans of Germany.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I shall send to the desk of the Secretary in a moment the press report of the street car strike in Cleveland, Ohio, references to the difficulty by the National War Labor Board, and certain comments of Mr. Morrison, of the American Federation of Labor, thereon. If the Senate will tolerate me for about three minutes, I should like to make a short statement. There is no objection, Mr. President? The woman suffrage joint resolution is pending and undisposed of in this body, coming over here from the House.

Last September, under stress of war conditions, in Cleveland women became street car conductors, taking the place of those who were in war service or had gone into the military or naval service. There not many days ago, Mr. President, a strike was instituted on the ground that the emergency having passed, the armistice having been signed some time ago, the unions of Cleveland would not tolerate longer the presence of women as car conductors in that city. The matter came before the National War Labor Board. It was ruled by that board that the women conductors in the Cleveland street car system must go. Mr. Morrison, of the American Federation of Labor, its secretary, says:

Organized labor has not suspended any of its rules; it has not held any of its fundamental laws in abeyance; it has simply acquiesced in certain things done by the Government because by such acquiescence it was believed the war could be more speedily brought to a successful termination. All rules which experience has shown are necessary to obtain for labor its just rights are still in full force and effect, and none has ever been abrogated or suspended.

Following this statement of Mr. Morrison, or, rather, preceding it, if I get the point of time correctly, was the ruling by the War Labor Board that the women conductors must be dispensed with in the city of Cleveland.

On the 6th day of December, 1918, here in the city of Washington a crowd of suffragettes were rotten-egged at Lafayette Park. They were in pursuance of a lawful right, holding an assembly. The purposes of that assembly I have no sympathy with. I have no sympathy with their picketing or with some of the remarks made at that assembly. I think the President has done as much to officially forward the passage of the joint resolution as any occupant of the President's office can well do, and I am not in sympathy with their criticism in this regard. Nevertheless if the women of Ohio or of the country had the same vote that men have they would not be rotten-egged in Washington, nor would they be discharged, with the approval of the secretary of the Federation of Labor and the finding of the National War Labor Board, from their service in Cleveland, Ohio, as street car conductors. If they were good enough to

serve when the country was in the stress of a great emergency, they are good enough to continue that service until they see fit to voluntarily retire.

While the joint resolution is pending and undisposed of here, this disregard of the rights of women in this country probably will continue. Such exhibitions as the rotten-egging of women in Washington, whatever their conduct may be, whatever the cause which they represent may be, however much I may not be in sympathy with them, their discharge merely because they are women and not because they are not performing their duties correctly as conductors of street cars—those matters are a disgrace to Washington, they are a disgrace to the city of Cleveland, and they are a reflection upon the sense of fair play that belongs to the American male citizen.

I trust the joint resolution will come in due time to a vote again, that ultimately it will pass, and that woman may be clothed with the right of a ballot, so that she may protect herself against such discrimination both in occupation and in her right of lawful assembly and expressing her sentiments.

I ask that these matters, including a protest of the National Women's Trade Union League night before last here in Washington, in which Mrs. Robbins and others entered their protest on these matters, may be incorporated in the RECORD and printed at length. I do not ask that they be read, but I think they ought to be preserved to be used in connection with the suffrage resolution which is still pending.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLEVELAND STREET CAR STRIKE ENDS.

CLEVELAND, OHIO, December 6.

Following an all-day conference, 2,400 striking motormen and conductors of the Cleveland Railway Co., who quit work Tuesday morning, have voted to accept the proposition of President John J. Stanley, of the company, that he would dismiss 150 women conductors by March 1.

The company officials and representatives of employees met and signed the agreement which ended the strike. The women conductors have been employed since September 1. Cleveland was without car service for three days.

WOMEN START FIGHT FOR JOBS—NATIONAL TRADES UNION TO MAKE CLEVELAND CASE TEST FOR NATION.

The National Women's Trade Union League last night announced through its president, Mrs. Raymond Robbins, that it would support the women street car conductors in Cleveland in their fight to retain their positions, which the National War Labor Board recently decided should be given up to men to end a strike. It will be made a test of the economic independence of women and the right to jobs they now hold as a result of the war.

Mrs. Robbins telegraphed to the women that "the league is standing by you in your fight for the right to work," and urged them to enter a formal appeal from the decisions of the National War Labor Board.

"The Cleveland case," said an officer of the league, "is but a symptom of a serious industrial possibility which will manifest itself in other occupations if this decision by the National War Labor Board is allowed to stand. It is monstrous that the Government itself should establish a precedent like this at a time so critical to the history of the whole world. The women of the country will resist it, of course, and the National Women's Trade Union League is prepared to go the limit to fight an injustice like this. We call upon all the women of the country to join us."

WAR LABOR BOARD'S DECISION ON WOMAN CONDUCTORS, TOPIC—SECRETARY MORRISON, OF FEDERATION OF LABOR, REGARDS DECLARATION THAT THEIR EMPLOYMENT IS NOT ESSENTIAL TO ROADS' SUCCESS AS PRECEDENT.

Organized labor is taking especial interest in the decision of the War Labor Board declaring the employment of women on the street railways of Cleveland not essential to the successful operation of the roads. Frank Morrison, secretary of the American Federation of Labor, asserts that in the judgment of the organization the precedent established by the board is likely to be followed all over the country.

"Organized labor has not suspended any of its rules; it has not held any of its fundamental laws in abeyance; it has simply acquiesced in certain things done by the Government, because by such acquiescence it was believed the war could be more speedily brought to a successful termination," said Mr. Morrison. "All rules which experience has shown are necessary to obtain for labor its just rights are still in full force and effect, and none has either been abrogated or suspended."

RETICENT ON FEDERATION ATTITUDE.

Mr. Morrison refused to say what the attitude of the federation would be regarding what are known in munition factories and among ship-builders as "mushroom mechanics." These are young men who have not served their time as apprentices, but have, in many cases, taken on tasks that under ordinary circumstances are not assigned to men until they have spent four years acquiring knowledge of their trade.

"This is a matter too complicated for me to discuss at the present time. It requires a great deal of thought and exhaustive treatment," Mr. Morrison said.

Mr. Morrison intimated that when the various departments employed "mushroom mechanics" organized labor did not protest, neither did it consent to the proceeding. But the exigencies of the war required that it acquiesce.

It was pointed out to Mr. Morrison that if organized labor, now that the war is over, declines longer to "acquiesce" many thousands of boys who did the work of men during the war must return to the activities usually assigned to boys or go back to school.

REGARDED AS DIFFICULT PROBLEM.

"I can't comment on that phase of the matter," Mr. Morrison said. In another responsible quarter it was stated that the problems of disposing of the woman in overalls and in uniform will be even more

difficult of solution than the "mushroom-mechanic problem." Many thousands of women are working at lathes in factories, are employed as riveters by the Emergency Fleet Corporation, or are engaged in other fields which before the war were not open to women workers.

"Women mechanics will have to leave the Shipping Board," an official of that organization said. "They are war-emergency workers. The war having ended, the emergency ceases to exist, therefore the woman mechanic or helper can not expect much longer to remain in this field."

EGGS FIRED AT "SUFFS"—LAFAYETTE STATUE AN UNCOOKED OMELET AFTER FEW HOURS—YOUNG GIRLS START RUMPUS—TWO MAIDS FROM THE WEST TEAR DOWN BANNER UNCOMPLIMENTARY TO WILSON BORNE AT MILITANTS' MEETING—THEY AND TWO MALES, ALSO DISTURBERS, TAKEN BY POLICE.

Facing a hostile crowd, suffragettes who met in Lafayette Square last night were forced to dodge an occasional volley of eggs thrown by soldiers, who jeered and heckled the speakers from the time they began their meetings at 1 o'clock in the afternoon until the meetings ended at 9 o'clock last night. Although none of the suffragettes was hit, the statue of Lafayette resembled an uncooked omelet.

Two war workers, Miss Margaret Rose Botting and Miss Nell Louise Bowen, both of 2030 F Street NW., led a crowd shortly after 8 o'clock which tore down and destroyed the "suff" banner.

GIRLS PAY \$25 COLLATERAL.

After an hour in the house of detention both girls, who came from Illinois to work for democracy, were released on \$25 each collateral. Clayton West, 1796 Columbia Road, and John Rankin, 14 S Street NW., also were arrested.

The banner which was torn down read: "We protest! Wilson has sailed away to aid democracy in Europe, while he with his party is responsible for denying democracy to 20,000,000 citizens of America. An autocrat at home is a poor champion of liberty abroad. We want democracy here!"

POLICEMEN CALL FOR HELP.

That there would be trouble was apparent shortly after the suffragettes assembled at 1 o'clock. The two policemen on hand at the beginning of the meeting were forced to call for reinforcements to hold the crowd in check. Soldiers and sailors set up rival meetings, sang and shouted.

The meeting was one of a series, held in preparation for the big demonstration on December 16, when women from every State in the country will demand immediate passage of the Anthony amendment.

STRUCTURES ON UNION STATION PLAZA.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a very short editorial from the morning Herald of this city, in which is discussed the question of investigating the construction of the buildings now in course of completion upon the Union Station Plaza, which I ask to have read. It deals with a matter which Congress should take cognizance of immediately and stop the needless waste of public funds.

There being no objection, the editorial was read as follows:

UNION STATION PLAZA HOUSING FIZZLE.

The Housing Corporation wants to spend \$400,000 more to complete the 90 per cent completed housing project on the Union Station Plaza. Of this sum \$100,000 is to go for construction and the remainder for laundry, café, and furniture.

Questionnaires to determine the expediency of completing this housing operation in face of a probable exodus of war workers are being sent to all Government departments by the Senate Committee on Buildings and Grounds, which is investigating the United States Housing Bureau.

It would be far more desirable if the Senate committee would quiz certain Housing Corporation officials as to the delays of their building programs. Their work has been characterized by unfulfilled promises. It appears that the Housing Corporation, as far as its work locally is concerned, is the one Government department during the war which did not satisfactorily accomplish what it set out to do.

To the inconvenience of 2,000 women war workers the buildings on the Union Station Plaza have met with a series of delays in the course of their construction. Originally the plan, according to promises, was to have these houses ready for occupancy months ago. Now they are but 90 per cent completed and past performances of the Housing Corporation do not warrant the granting of another chance to finish construction.

It seems to be admitted by the testimony to the Senate committee that the buildings between the Capitol and Union Station would only be occupied for a year, if now completed, and then be removed.

If the immediate comfort of 2,000 tired women war workers were assured, we would say go ahead and spend \$400,000 more after already wasting \$1,800,000 on this work, from which not a cent's worth of benefit will be derived aside from those who received this public money for labor and material.

But if the Housing Corporation will act with the same speed and judgment in spending an additional \$400,000 on this project as they did in spending nearly \$2,000,000, the buildings will perhaps be completed in time to tear them down.

The improper housing of the thousands of war workers, the certain neglect of some one responsible for the providing of proper accommodations, will always be remembered over the entire country by those who suffered as the one black mark on Washington's otherwise glorious war record.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 12917. An act to provide for the establishment of a sanatorium for the treatment of persons discharged from the military and naval forces of the United States, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 358. A joint resolution authorizing and directing the payment of the usual compensation of Representatives in Congress to those Members of the House who have been discharged from their military or naval duties.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled joint resolution (H. J. Res. 356) authorizing the payment of salaries of officers and employees of Congress for December, 1918.

PEACE TERMS.

Mr. LODGE. I present a statement from the executive board of the National Committee of Patriotic Societies, representing 46 leading patriotic war organizations. I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the statement was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 7, 1918.

The executive board of the National Committee of Patriotic Societies, representing 46 leading patriotic organizations of the country, with an aggregate membership of more than 2,500,000 in all, has formulated, with the cooperation of experts in international affairs, "dictated peace" terms for adoption at Versailles, which include payment by the central powers of the full cost of the war, including reparation and indemnity for all damages and deaths, the former German colonies not to be returned, control of raw materials by the allies, and disarmament of Germany with exclusion from any league of nations until the discharge of all her obligations. It is the conclusion of the exhaustive study of the world peace question by the board. The terms are as follows:

- Restitution and reparation:
 1. Restitution of all indemnities levied and property taken by the central powers.
 2. Reparation of all damage to property caused by the central powers, including depredations at sea.
 3. Indemnities to cover civilians murdered or injured, including those (a) in invaded countries, and (b) on the high seas.
 4. (a) The central powers to bear the cost of war to the allies—the war debts of Belgium, France, and Serbia to be paid first.
 - (b) Application of public and private resources of central powers to such payments and the control of the finances of the central powers until all restitution and reparation are carried out.
- Territorial:
 1. Alsace-Lorraine restored to France.
 2. Italia Irredenta restored to Italy.
 3. Lands under Turkish rule to be freed and their governments reorganized in conformity with racial conditions and under the protection of the allied powers.
 4. Dardanelles to be under control of allied powers.
 5. Serbia, Montenegro, Albania, Roumania, and Greece to receive territories rightfully theirs by racial, lingual, and national claims.
 6. Independence of Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Jugo-Slavia, including all districts inhabited by Poles, Czechoslovaks, and Jugo-Slavs.
 7. Schleswig-Holstein to determine whether it wishes to return to Denmark; Duchy of Luxemburg to be independent, or joined to Belgium or France if her people so desire.
 8. Order to be restored in Russia and provisions made for freedom from all Teutonic encroachments.
 9. German colonies not to be returned to Germany.
 10. Kiel Canal and Heligoland to be under control of allied powers.
- General:
 1. Treaties of Bucharest and Brest-Litovsk to be abrogated.
 2. Navies of the central powers surrendered to the allies.
 3. Disarmament of the central powers.
 4. Necessary enemy territory to be occupied until restitution and reparation are effected.
 5. Punishment not only of the ex-Kaiser but of the others responsible for the war and for the violations of The Hague Conventions.
 6. International arbitration and league of nations as complement of policy of national defense. The central powers not to be admitted into the league until full discharge of their obligations under the treaty and until they achieve permanent establishment of free institutions.
 7. Control of raw materials by the allies until the central powers are admitted to the league of nations.

This is a correct statement regarding the attitude, conclusions, and wishes of the executive board of the National Committee of Patriotic Societies, which was organized February 21, 1917, to assist in the coordination of the work of national preparedness and patriotic service carried on by the various organizations in the United States.

The members of the executive board are: Edward Harding, chairman, Boy Scouts of America; Philip S. Post, committeeman at large; William S. Ellis, National Security League; Langdon P. Marvin, Military Training Camps Association of United States; Mrs. George Thacher Guernsey, Daughters of American Revolution; George Hewitt Myers, Army League of the United States; Edwin O. Holter, committeeman at large; Mrs. Lewis B. Stillwell, National League for Women's Service.

The represented societies are: Aeronautical Society of America, American Committee for Devastated France, American Defense Society (Inc.), American Rights League, Army League of the United States, Army Relief Society, Association of Military Colleges and Schools, America's Allies Cooperative Committee, Boys' Club Federation, Boy Scouts of America, Colonial Dames of the Seventeenth Century, Colonial Daughters of America, Daughters of American Revolution, Descendants of Signers of Declaration of Independence, Duryea War Relief (Inc.), General Society Daughters of the Revolution, High School Volunteers of the United States, International Lyceum Association, League to Enforce Peace, Military Order of Loyal Legion of United States, Military Order of Foreign Wars of United States, Military Training Camps Association, National Americanization Committee, National Association for Universal Military Training, National Civic Federation, National Committee of One Hundred, National League for Women's Service, National Security League, National Society of United States Daughters of 1812, National Society of Daughters of Founders and Patriots of America, Naval and Military Order Spanish-American War, Naval Training Association, Navy League of the United States, Order of Founders and Patriots of America, Patriotic Service League, Power-Craft Association, Society of American Wars, Sons of the Revolution, Sons of Veterans United States of America, Special Aid Society for

American Preparedness, Trench Packet Comfort Committee, United States Power Squadron, Universal Military Training League, Women's Department National Civic Federation, Women's Naval Service (Inc.), Affiliated Society Southern Commercial Congress.

EDWARD HARDING,
Chairman Executive Board.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LODGE presented a petition of Local Division No. 72, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Boston, Mass., praying for the freedom of Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Republican Club of New York City, N. Y., praying that the German nation be not fed by the United States, and that German goods of whatever description be not received, and that this country shall have no commercial relations with Germany, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. NEW. I send to the desk resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., by the friends of Ireland, held on one evening of last week, and I ask that they be printed in the RECORD without reading.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Memorial in favor of free government for Ireland, adopted at a mass meeting of citizens of Indiana at Tomlinson Hall, Indianapolis, Ind., Sunday, December 1.

As citizens of the United States, a Nation that has successfully battled for the ideals that stand for democracy and liberty of the world, we are interested in the welfare of all nations, including Ireland and England, and particularly so in Ireland, as she is our nearest European neighbor and as citizens of Irish blood constitute a very large proportion of our vast population.

We hold that there should be no hostility or antagonism between the Irish and English peoples; that, as neighboring States, they have many interests in common, and that the peace and welfare of these two peoples are essential to the tranquillity and progress of the world.

We hold with President Wilson "that no people should be forced under a sovereignty under which it does not wish to live," and that "all well-defined nationalities should have the right to choose their own form of government by free and untrammelled franchise, and decide by majority vote the form of government they desire," carrying into practice the time-honored American doctrine, "all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed."

We hold that Ireland, our nearest European neighbor, is a "well-defined nationality," both racially, historically, and geographically. For more than 700 years she has steadfastly refused to recognize the English Government as the rightful government of Ireland. She has demonstrated her opposition to alien rule by revolts and rebellions every 25 years of that period, in which struggles her best patriots have given their lives and her unarmed people have made every sacrifice in the cause of liberty. Apart from this she has constitutionally battled for the right of a native government, and even under a limited franchise she has for the last 40 years returned to Parliament 86 out of 101 parliamentary representatives pledged to legislative independence.

We point to the fact that within the last year, at a convention of Irish representatives, selected by the English Premier, Lloyd-George, and presided over by that eminent Protestant Irish leader, Sir Horace Plunkett, a scheme for an Irish government was adopted by a decisive majority vote of more than 85 per cent of the delegates; that this decision, in the form of an official report, was submitted as requested to the English Government, which had promised to act on the report of said convention, and that no action whatever has been taken, and that the people of Ireland are now held in subjection to a rule of militarism and force, their leaders imprisoned and deported without charge or trial, and all the rights and liberties of free men denied them.

We hold that this condition is contrary to the expressed ideals of the nations that fought "to free the world from autocracy," abhorrent to the American people and to all lovers of liberty and directly contrary to the declarations of our President at the time the United States entered the war, declarations which he has reiterated and emphasized as recently as September 27 of this year.

This, being our conviction, and mindful of the devotion and loyalty of the Irish race to America from the days of the Revolution down to the present time, we citizens of Indianapolis, in mass meeting assembled, call upon our President on the eve of his momentous journey to the peace conference to insist that Ireland, like Belgium, Poland, Bohemia, Schleswig-Holstein, Finland, Serbia, and the Czech and Jugo Slavs, shall have the right of self-determination.

Under whatever form of government the Irish people may establish, any minority of the Irish people can be fully protected by proper guaranty, and if any security for the good faith of the Irish nation be desired, as American citizens we urge the President of the United States to give that security or indorsement, to the end that Ireland's liberty and independence be secured by international agreement, and that the Irish and English peoples may enter "the new day of democracy" as friendly neighboring nations, their differences forever ended. The unhappy cause removed by the end of the domination of one of them by the other.

And that these resolutions be telegraphed to-night to the President and to our Representatives and Senators for introduction to-morrow in the Congress of the United States.

And, further, that our Representatives and Senators be, and they are hereby, requested to support in Congress this week the resolution introduced by Representative GALLAGHER, of Illinois, now before the Foreign Affairs Committee asking the United States to intervene at the peace council for self-determination for Ireland.

Mr. KELLOGG. I send to the desk a telegram in the nature of a petition to the Senate of the United States. If there be no objection, I should like to have the Secretary read the telegram, omitting the signatures thereto.

There being no objection, the telegram was read, as follows:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., December 9.

Hon. F. B. KELLOGG,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Resolution adopted at mass meeting held in Minneapolis December 8, 1918:

Whereas well-confirmed reports have reached us of terrible massacres of Jews in Poland and Galicia, where hundreds of innocent and helpless men, women, and children were murdered or burned to death by Polish soldiers; and

Whereas it is well known that certain influential elements in Poland not only connive at these atrocities against the Jews, but actually direct and encourage them; and

Whereas the rights to life, security, and the pursuit of happiness of 4,000,000 Jews, who have lived in Poland for hundreds of years and who have contributed to her industrial and commercial developments, are thus openly and flagrantly violated by the new Polish State, that has secured freedom as a result of the great sacrifices brought by America and the allies in the great war for democracy: Therefore be it

Resolved at a mass meeting of the Jewish community of Minneapolis assembled at the Kenneseth Israel Synagogue to protest against those outrages upon the Jewish people, That we appeal to the United States Congress to intervene on behalf of our persecuted people in Poland, and that this resolution be at once forwarded to both Houses of Congress in Washington.

Mr. NELSON presented memorials of O'Connor & Van Bergen, of St. Paul; of William L. Henderson & Co., of St. Paul; and of L. J. Buchanan and sundry other citizens of Minneapolis, all in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the proposed tax of 10 per cent on rentals of private wires in the pending revenue bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from Janney, Sempie, Hill & Co. and sundry other citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the early passage of the pending revenue bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Trades and Labor Council, of Winona, Minn., favoring the terms of peace as proposed by the President, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Pioneers of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Ramsey County, Minn., praying for the freedom of Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JONES of Washington presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce and Commercial Club of Seattle, Wash., relative to the deportation of aliens who have withdrawn their applications to become citizens in order to escape operations of the draft, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a memorial of the Central Labor Council of Seattle, Wash., remonstrating against the forced sale by the Government of properties in the State of Washington under the jurisdiction of the Spruce Production Division of the United States Signal Corps, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of the Sectional Central Labor Council of Spokane, Wash., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation throwing aside the restrictions against importation of Asiatic labor, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce and Commercial Club of Seattle, Wash., praying for the designation of November 11 as the proper day for national thanksgiving, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce and Commercial Club of Seattle, Wash., favoring the adoption of an amendment to section 202 of the pending war-revenue bill, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WARREN presented resolutions adopted by the Retail Grocers and Butchers' Association of Cheyenne, Wyo., favoring the adoption of an amendment to section 202 of the pending revenue bill, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. FLETCHER. I present resolutions unanimously adopted by the Board of Trade of Orlando, Fla.; also resolutions from the war-tax advisory committee of the National Association of Credit Men, together with a telegram from the president of the Credit Men's Association and the president of the Wholesale Grocers' Association of Tampa, Fla., favoring the fixing of the amount of taxes to be assessed against the year 1918 at the earliest possible time, and praying for the speedy passage of the pending revenue bill. I ask that the resolutions lie on the table, the bill having been reported.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will lie on the table.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a petition of the Rotary Club of Battle Creek, Mich., praying for universal military training, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Slavonic Workingman's Aid Union, of Detroit, Mich., relative to the terms of peace, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the Board of Education of Niles, Mich., favoring the establishment of a national department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. HALE presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Portland, Me., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit amateur wireless installation, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

THE REVENUE.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I desire to offer a very brief minority report (Rept. No. 617, Part II), the minority consisting of myself, to the pending revenue bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, if there is no objection, I desire to present at this time the views of the minority (Rept. No. 617, Part III) of the Committee on Finance on House bill 12863, known as the revenue bill of 1918, signed by all of the minority, with the exception of the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who, I am informed, will make a report expressing his own views.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be received and printed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in that connection I desire to state that I had the privilege of reading the report only a short time ago. Last Friday I reserved the right to offer further additional views prepared by myself upon the bill. I have not had the time to dictate my views since reading the reports which have just been presented, but I will do so within the next couple of hours; and I ask the privilege, when those views have been prepared, of handing them in at the desk and having them printed, if there be no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I desire to say that after I have examined these several reports, if I find I am not able to subscribe to them I ask consent to submit my views upon the pending bill?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, permission is granted.

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (S. 5058) to authorize the counties of Morton and Burleigh, in the State of North Dakota, to construct a bridge across the Missouri River near Bismarck, N. Dak., and I submit a report (No. 619) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. LEWIS:

A bill (S. 5137) to amend section 79 of the Judicial Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 5138) to provide for the erection of a Federal courthouse and public building at Bloomington, Ill.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 5139) to expel and exclude from the United States aliens who, to escape military service, have withdrawn their declaration of intention to become citizens; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 5140) to forbid the payment of pensions to alien enemies;

A bill (S. 5141) granting an increase of pension to Walter C. Fairweather (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5142) granting an increase of pension to George F. Griffith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HALE:

A bill (S. 5143) granting an increase of pension to Peter Prock (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5144) granting a pension to Lizzie E. Hinds (with accompanying paper); and

A bill (S. 5145) granting a pension to Carrie E. Hewett (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEW:

A bill (S. 5146) granting an increase of pension to William Young;

A bill (S. 5147) granting an increase of pension to Anderson Ward;

A bill (S. 5148) granting an increase of pension to George W. Yocum;

A bill (S. 5149) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Wiend;

A bill (S. 5150) granting an increase of pension to John H. Welker;

A bill (S. 5151) granting a pension to Mary E. Hagerdorn (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5152) granting an increase of pension to John N. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 5153) granting an increase of pension to Hiram F. Stover;

A bill (S. 5154) granting an increase of pension to Henry Wilton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5155) granting a pension to Charlotte M. Potterton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5156) granting a pension to Mary Kelly (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5157) granting a pension to Louisa Leppla (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5158) granting an increase of pension to Francis Straub (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5159) granting an increase of pension to Peter C. Danforth (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5160) granting a pension to Eliza A. Teters (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5161) granting an increase of pension to Isobel M. Evans (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5162) granting an increase of pension to Carthenia H. Moore (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5163) granting an increase of pension to Smith Culler (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5164) granting an increase of pension to Robert B. Patrick (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5165) granting an increase of pension to George F. Hood (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 5166) granting an increase of pension to Stewart Orr (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5167) granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Stumph (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 5168) for the relief of commissioned officers of the Army recommended for promotion; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 5169) to accept from the Southern Oregon Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Oregon, a reconveyance of the lands granted to the State of Oregon by the act approved March 3, 1869, entitled "An act granting lands to the State of Oregon to aid in the construction of a military wagon road from the navigable waters of Coos Bay to Roseburg, in said State," commonly known as the Coos Bay wagon-road grant, to provide for the disposition of said lands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 5170) granting a pension to John S. Dornblaser; to the Committee on Pensions.

EXCLUSION OF ALIENS.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, the draft boards in our section of the country in the discharge of their duties found a great many individuals who had declared their intention to become citizens who, under the law that we passed subsequently, declared their intention to renounce their citizenship in order to avoid military service. Our draft boards, our chambers of commerce, and various other organizations have urged that such persons be deported from the country. In order to carry out that view, in which I very heartily concur, I introduce the bill which I send to the desk and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Immigration.

The bill (S. 5139) to expel and exclude from the United States aliens who, to escape military service, have withdrawn their declaration of intention to become citizens, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Immigration.

CABLE SERVICE.

Mr. SPENCER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 376), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Postmaster General be, and he is hereby, requested to inform the Senate, if not inconsistent with the public service, whether information can be promptly asked for and received by cable, at the request of the immediate relatives of any officer or soldier in the overseas service of the country, where no word has been received from such officers and soldiers for more than six weeks, as to whether such officer or soldier was, on November 11, 1918, dead or alive.

ORDNANCE AND QUARTERMASTER'S SUPPLIES.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk providing for an investigation of the Bureau of Ordnance and the Quartermaster General's office by the Committee on Military Affairs. I ask that the resolution be read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 377) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs shall proceed at once to investigate the Bureau of Ordnance and of the Quartermaster General of the War Department with particular reference to the manner in which funds appropriated by Congress for ordnance and supplies have been expended by those offices during the present war with Germany; and that said committee shall report to the Senate the number of 3-inch and other artillery shells, small-arms ammunition, rifles, automatic rifles, light and heavy machine guns, light and heavy field artillery, with the necessary carriages and other parts and appurtenances thereof, and the amount, kind, quality, cost, and disposition of food, clothing, and other necessary supplies and equipment procured by the said Ordnance Office and the office of the Quartermaster General, respectively, and supplied during the said war to the military forces of the United States in France, and what portion of the same were procured in the United States and what portion in France.

Said committee is directed to further inquire and report to the Senate the cost at which said guns, ammunition, supplies, food, clothing, and equipment, or other articles referred to above, was procured, whether or not the supply of the same was adequate or overabundant, and whether or not in each case the prices paid for the same by the officials of said offices was reasonable and just; and said committee shall further inquire into the system and method of organization of said offices and the number of employees therein during the present war, the methods of selection and commissioning of officers and appointment of employees therein, the reasonableness or unreasonableness of the compensation paid to employees, the efficiency or inefficiency of the conduct of the business assigned to said offices, bureaus, and the various subdivisions, branches, and agencies thereof.

Said committee is further directed to report to the Senate any failure to procure adequate supplies, ordnance, or equipment in the matters mentioned above and any misconduct or abuse in connection therewith, if any, and shall ascertain and report to the Senate the exact name and identity of the officer or employee of the United States responsible therefor in any degree; and in case there was any failure of procurement or supply in respect to the matters aforesaid said committee shall report the cause of such failure and whether or not agents of the German Government were in any way responsible therefor.

For the purposes of this resolution the said committee is authorized to draw, by its chairman, on the contingent fund of the Senate to pay all necessary expenses properly vouched for by its chairman, to subpoena witnesses and documents, to administer oaths, and to do all acts and things necessary to the carrying out of the purposes of this resolution.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, as a reason for offering the resolution I submit, and ask to have printed in the RECORD, an article by a well-known newspaper correspondent of this city, Mr. P. H. Whaley. Among the statements made in that article is the following:

The total shipment of 3-inch shells of all kinds sent from the United States to France during the whole period we were in the war was only about 3,000,000, and this supply, under the intensive conditions prevailing, would hardly have met the requirements for a single month.

I beg leave to say just a word in that connection. In the case of a great manufacturing nation, such as the United States, whose manufacturers, mechanics, and scientists are noted for their efficiency. It would seem to be impossible that by mere inefficiency, by mere mistakes, such a tremendous failure as is alleged here could have occurred. The same failure occurred in the production and shipment to France of airplanes; and the same sort of mistakes were made in regard to the supplies which came under the activities of the Quartermaster General of the Army. So the query necessarily arises as to whether or not this colossal failure of a great and wealthy nation to supply its troops with essential ammunition, artillery, and ordnance was not caused intentionally, whether or not there were treasonable activities that were thwarting the efforts of the War Department. As a part of the resolution, I have asked the Committee on Military Affairs to inquire into that phase of the question.

I remark in passing that, in my judgment, if half a dozen or so of traitors and spies had been executed under the law applicable to criminals of that kind in the early stages of the war many lives of better men would have been saved. I ask leave to have printed in that connection a brief statement purporting to give an inventory of the kind and character of

clothing and other equipment now on hand, procured by the Quartermaster General's office.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

MUNITION OUTPUT SERIOUS FAILURE—NEGLECT TO SUPPLY ARMY OVERSEAS WITH GUNS AND MUNITIONS SHARPLY CRITICIZED—HARBORD SAVES DAY—SUPPLY OF 3-INCH SHELLS SENT DURING WHOLE WAR TIME NOT ENOUGH FOR A MONTH.

P. H. Whaley writes from Washington to the Chicago Tribune on the failure of the United States to furnish guns and munitions in sufficient quantities to our armies in France. He says:

In October the Ordnance Department began to be seriously disturbed about its failure to supply the Army in France with guns and munitions. Not only were the cables bringing complaints and urgent demands, but returning officers had begun to talk rather boldly.

Get-together plans were therefore discussed by Ordnance officers, many of whom were former civilians, and an effort was made to bring some sort of order out of the existing chaos. It was also proposed to take some measures to anticipate a probable investigation by Congress.

Under date of November 21 an Associated Press dispatch came through from France which filled most American citizens with pride and satisfaction. Those who knew the truth and had reason to fear an investigation did not know what to make of it. They did not know whether it was a first coat of whitewash or an indication of more trouble.

The dispatch contained a message of thanks sent by Lieut. Gen. Liggett, in command of the First Army, to Gen. Harbord, in command of the supply service, as follows:

LIGGETT PRAISES HARBORD.

"The First Army of the American Expeditionary Forces desires to convey its full appreciation for the great assistance afforded by the officers and soldiers of the service of supply during its recent battles.

"The battles of the Argonne and the Meuse were hard and continuous for nearly two months. During this period you never failed us. Food, ammunition, clothing, medical attendance, and other supplies always were at hand. Our confidence in your efforts was well repaid. The First Army of the American Expeditionary Forces congratulates the service of supply on its share in the great American success.

"Without your energy and push back of us our efforts would not have succeeded. You share with us the glory of our deeds."

INDEFATIGABLE EFFORTS NEEDED.

The significance of that dispatch was probably not lost on Gen. Harbord. He had, in truth, supplied the front-line troops with the artillery ammunition absolutely needed, but by what indefatigable efforts only he and the men associated with him and the commanding generals knew.

It was altogether proper that Gen. Liggett, on behalf of the First Army, should have thanked the supply service, because it was well known to Gen. Liggett that Gen. Harbord had been compelled to get ammunition from anywhere to compensate for that which he was expecting, but not getting, from America.

While the front-line ammunition that Gen. Liggett was so thankful for was flowing forward from the supply service, cables from that same service were also going forward to Washington urging that as French resources were being strained to the utmost America must deliver munitions at once or the proper volume of flow to the front could not be maintained. And there was no reserve.

SUPPLY WOEFULLY SHORT.

When it is known that the total shipment of 3-inch shells of all kinds sent from the United States to France during the whole period we were in the war was only about 3,000,000 and that this supply, under the intensive conditions prevailing, would hardly have met the requirements for a single month, some idea of the alarming conditions which Gen. Pershing faced may be gained.

It will be said that "we got by," so what's the difference?

Pass the credit to Gen. Harbord and the supply service, as Gen. Liggett did. They "made good" when Washington fell down. Pass the credit to the French, who strained their resources to help out. But do not deceive the public by making it think that American ammunition was winning the momentous victories which led to the signing of the armistice. It was not true. It was humiliatingly untrue.

RUSSIAN SHELLS NOT SHIPPED.

Yet all this time there were thousands, even millions, of fully loaded shells on this side of the water waiting to be shipped. Most of them, it is true, lacked some essential part. Others which had been manufactured for Russia were in perfect condition, but the ownership of them was in question. The use of them might have offended Lenin.

All this time, too, the Ordnance Department of the Navy was working under high speed. Perhaps it was because the Navy never made a specialty of efficiency experts and systems.

Consider, for instance, the 20,000,000 or more small-caliber shell orders which were placed in Canada. No deliveries were ever made. The Canadian manufacturers seemed to be in doubt as to whether they were to manufacture the shells complete or simply build them in part and ship them to the United States to be finished. A great deal of dependence was placed on these Canadian orders.

COULD NOT PASS INSPECTION.

A firm in Indiana had a contract for some 10,000,000 small parts. It was expected to be producing about 20,000 of these parts a day, beginning months ago. After some thousands had been finished it was discovered that they were made wrong. They did not pass inspection and were worthless. More delay followed until the faults could be corrected.

This required days and even weeks. Finally production was begun again, just before the end of the war. Meantime otherwise perfectly good shells were waiting for the aforesaid parts.

There was a failure to coordinate. The production program was distributed among a number of firms all over the country. Under a perfect system of industrial organization and perfect shipments by railroad assembly might have been accomplished without unreasonable delay. But as a matter of fact, in an ordinary world the success of the program as outlined would have been a miracle. It was foredoomed to failure.

ALLIES KEPT ARMY SUPPLIED.

It is true that arrangements had been made with England and France to keep our Army provided with artillery and artillery ammunition for a certain period. Cargo space was required for things more vital at the moment than heavy artillery.

But both France and England had taxed their resources severely to supply ammunition for their own armies. France, in particular, had changed even her shipyards into munition factories. England was putting her young women into the loading plants. A year ago it was understood that America would soon be sending ammunition in quantities, possibly even supplementing the supplies of the allies.

Twenty months after the opening of the war England was producing shrapnel shells in vast quantities, millions a month. The complaint of Lord Northcliffe was not as to the quantity of production, but as to the policy which insisted on shrapnel instead of high-explosive shells.

PLANS CALLED FOR PRODUCTION.

The United States 18 months after entering the war, although dozens of factories had been making munitions for the allies during the preceding years, was actually delivering virtually no ammunition at all at the front. It is almost inconceivable. If the plans had not called for any production it would have been a different matter. But they did call for production. They called for deliveries which should have been made months ago. There was simply a collapse.

The chameleon had nothing on the Ordnance Department. It had a positive genius for changing its designs. No sooner would a big plant get its equipment and tools together and begin quantity production than orders would come from Washington to hold up operations. In a day or two some officer would arrive with new drawings.

WORK WAS EXPENSIVE.

The workmen would sit in the yard and wait until the tools and machinery could be changed. It was expensive work, but the Government paid the bills.

Indeed, the changing of plans was carried on to such an extent that some factories actually spent more time readjusting their machinery than they employed in production. Others simply threw up their hands and their contracts.

Some firms that had promised complete deliveries by June were hardly beginning deliveries in September, although they were manufacturing vital parts.

Ordnance production has become a sort of picture-puzzle game, which must have been amazingly interesting to some of the experts, but which daily became more and more of a threat to American lives and American success in battle.

When it became apparent that the facts were likely to become known the lid was clamped down closer than ever. The censorship at least was in working order. But with the signing of the armistice it became clear that the facts would eventually get out.

PLANNED DEFENSE IN ADVANCE.

There is evidence to show that it was hoped by carefully prepared publications to build up a defense in advance, and thus belittle the final exposure. The publication of these articles will prevent that. Also there are men in the Capitol who are acquainted with the startling conditions which have existed, and they will resist any attempt at whitewashing.

"I am not worried now," Secretary of War Baker said, "about any possibility that may have existed regarding a shortage of shells."

"The whole ordnance program," he added, "was in progress of development and had not reached the peak of delivery. It was rapidly progressing, making marked improvement, in delivery and transportation every week."

WAR DEPARTMENT'S RESERVE SUPPLIES ON HAND IN UNITED STATES AND FRANCE.

The War Department has these reserve stocks of supplies here and in France, it became known to-day:

Cotton coats	5,039,907
Denim coats	5,410,518
Wool coats	6,282,536
Jerkins	2,449,018
Mackinaws	19,660
Overcoats	4,167,841
Raincoats	2,170,220
Flannel shirts	9,742,824
Denim trousers	5,212,708
Cotton trousers and breeches	8,879,393
Wool trousers and breeches	8,581,829
Summer drawers	24,285,815
Winter drawers	21,050,798
Summer undershirts	27,075,892
Winter undershirts	17,437,280
Rubber hip boots	1,271,135
Rubber knee boots	859,211
Canvas leggings	7,268,419
Arctic overshoes	1,510,894
Woolen and spiral puttees	8,586,830
Russet marching shoes	3,548,660
Welt field shoes	3,314,783
Metallic fastened field shoes	4,018,636
Heavy wool stockings	25,042,752
Light wool stockings	21,070,492
Overseas caps	3,718,678
Service hats	3,120,946
Canton flannel gloves	1,599,527
Heavy leather gloves	3,084,565
Jersey knit gloves, pairs	5,968,015
Wool gloves, pairs	6,415,846
Leather mittens, pairs	3,733,779
Canton flannel mittens, pairs	2,125,907
Water sterilizing bags	38,592
Barracks bags	4,315,307
Bed sacks	4,180,861
Commercial blankets	1,035,822
Three-pound blankets	1,413,492
Two-pound blankets	2,963,287
Large paulins	38,442
Small paulins	20,134
Shelter-tent halves	1,147,205
Pyramidal tents	111,559

Stocks of materials for clothing and equipage as of November 1, consisting of stock on hand, in transit to depots, and in the hands of contractors follow:

O. D. cotton cloth, yards	12,894,655
Denim, yards	19,295,571

Duck for shelter tents, yards	4,081,894
Duck for paulins, yards	2,625,839
16 and 20 ounce melton, yards	10,688,130
30 and 32 ounce melton, yards	3,242,982
Flannel for shirts, yard	9,192,272

INDEPENDENCE OF ARMENIA.

Mr. LODGE. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, which, with the accompanying paper, I ask may be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 378), as follows:

Resolved, That in the opinion of the Senate, Armenia, including the six vilayets of Turkish Armenia and Cilicia, Russian Armenia, and the northern part of the Province of Azerbaijan, Persian Armenia, should be independent, and that it is the hope of the Senate that the peace conference will make arrangements for helping Armenia to establish an independent republic.

It is also the opinion of the Senate that provision should be made for the Syrians and other Christian populations of Asia Minor, and that those portions of Asia Minor where the Greeks are predominant should be placed under the control of the Government of Greece.

INDEPENDENCE OF COUNTRIES ON THE BALTIC COAST.

Mr. LODGE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 379), which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That in the opinion of the Senate, Lithuania should be separated from Russia and given independence, and that the same right should be extended to the Letts and to Estonia. All these people should have liberty and independence and their possessions on the Baltic coast make their independence a condition of great importance for the future freedom and peace of the world.

INDIAN GRAZING LANDS IN UTAH.

Mr. KING submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 381), which was read and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

Whereas in the counties of Duchesne and Uinta, in the State of Utah, there is a large body of Indians lands known as Indian grazing lands, which has not been allotted in severalty to the Indians of the Ute Tribe, which lands adjoin the Ashley National Forest in the State of Utah; and

Whereas said lands are valuable for grazing purposes and contain areas which are also specially adapted to agricultural use and occupation; and

Whereas said lands are not being utilized for any beneficial purpose and are excluded from the use of the white settlers in said counties; and

Whereas the said Indians for whose use said lands have ostensibly been set apart are unable to occupy or make any economic or beneficial use of the same; and

Whereas said Indians for whose use said lands have been segregated and set apart are not making an economic or adequate use of said lands, and will not in the future be able to make an economic or adequate use of said lands: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the Senate the present status of the so-called Indian grazing lands in Duchesne and Uinta Counties, Utah, and what means may be taken to extinguish the Indian title to said lands and open the same to use, settlement, and occupation, and whether it is convenient and advantageous to add said lands, or any part thereof, to the Uinta National Forest.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, my colleague, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS], in New York City, delivered an address to the National Association of Life Insurance Societies, on the 5th of December last, which was very learned, and which I think is a great contribution to those who are studying the problems which will arise after the war. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEWIS in the chair). The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

The address referred to is as follows:

AN ADDRESS DELIVERED BY SENATOR THOMAS DECEMBER 5, 1918, TO THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PRESIDENTS OF LIFE INSURANCE SOCIETIES AT NEW YORK CITY.

"The swift and dramatic close of the great war is justly celebrated as the mightiest military achievement of the centuries. Peace has come to the afflicted nations with a suddenness they never dreamed of. We rejoice that the great conflict has ended with victory and that our appalling sacrifice of blood and treasure was not made in vain.

"Our triumph is over Imperial Germany and all that she arrogantly typified. Her conquest makes the world safe for democracy. A greater task now confronts us. We must make democracy safe for the world. This task has long been obvious, but it was visioned upon the horizon of a remote future. The mighty force of recent events has thrust it in our very faces. We shall have prevailed with the struggle for self-government only when we shall have thoroughly performed this added duty.

"We expected that ample time would be given to prepare for the larger task. But the unexpected happened. Germany broke with her first great disaster. What seemed a mighty

engine of military power, strong beyond imagination, lacked the cohesive force of a lofty national morale, and crumbled into dust before the battle shock of a unified alliance.

"We were not prepared for war with Germany, but we overcame her. We are not prepared for the new contest, but we shall conquer again. Democracy's last external peril disappeared with the despotism of the Kaiser. Her remaining ones are internal. They inhere in her theories of government and thrive by her toleration. They ran riot in her dominions before the war. They raised their sinister heads during its prosecution. They are now before us and around us. America, the greatest of democracies, must safeguard its fundamental principles. Her Statue of Liberty enlightening the world is more than symbolic. It is actual. It typifies the America of the twentieth century.

"What is democracy? The term can not be defined with exactness. It can best be comprehended by the process of elimination, by asserting what it is not. Democracy is not militarism nor anarchy. It is not socialism nor lawlessness. It does not confer absolute freedom, for that is inconsistent with equality of right. It does not require a republic; for the development of its principles are strangers to many of them, while its blessings are enjoyed by the subjects of many monarchies.

"Democracy is synonymous with ordered liberty, which respects and safeguards the rights of all. Its congenial structure is republican, and Elihu Root has finally said that republican government is organized self-control. Henry Ward Beecher declared the real democratic idea to be not that every man should be on a level with every other, but that everyone shall have liberty without hindrance to be what God made him. Any condition interfering with this conception is an unhealthy one. It may be deemed essential to class interest, but it is not democratic.

"I can not in the limited time at my disposal present more than a bare outline of some of the actual and potential problems surrounding and confronting the United States, upon whose solution its welfare and integrity largely depend. Some of these are of prewar birth, some forged in the red furnace of war.

"Democracy finds its natural expansion in social, economic, and political development. From the friction thus engendered come the ills which threaten its integrity. These lines of development must now pass through a period of readjustment before they again become normal. It is in this interval that we should ascertain our condition and set our national house in order, that other nations may guide their future by the lamp of our experience.

"Perhaps the most insidious danger to republican institutions is the indifference of the citizen to his public duties. The beneficiaries of free government become indulgent and comfortable; their responsibilities grow irksome and annoying. Their vigilance relaxes in their struggle for material things. Their time is absorbed in the pursuit of gain. The diversion of their energies from the needs of government is the opportunity of privilege, and privilege undermines democracy. The ills of the body politic will continue until the people awake to a full sense of civic obligation and realize that theirs is the business of government. To bring about this condition is a fundamental factor in the public equation.

"The war leaves us the legacy of a stupendous debt. It will reach, if it does not exceed, \$35,000,000,000, or twice as much as the combined debt of the allied nations, including Russia, when the war began. The annual interest upon this stupendous sum will be \$1,400,000,000, nearly twice the net total of the Nation's annual prewar expenditure. This means a vastly increased rate and radius of taxation. The people must bear the burden, for Germany can not make indemnity. They will bear it willingly if economy in public administration and the application of every dollar to the public needs shall become the policy of the Government. They will not and should not be content if the gross extravagances of the past continue. In 1910 Senator Aldrich declared that ordinary efficiency in public administration would annually save the people \$300,000,000. It would now save twice that sum. If the taxpayers of America will unite in demanding a radical revision of our public service, a consolidation of duplicating bureaus, and the institution of the budget system in appropriations, it will be done. If they will also rigidly supervise public expenditures, taxation can be largely reduced. If they fail to do this, our appropriations will keep increasing, for every demand made upon the Treasury is complied with when political or organized force is behind it, and everything in these days is organized except the man who pays the taxes. Moreover, the huge debts of the nations, however well their revenues are managed and applied, will always be a fruitful source of disaffection. To those possessing none of it,

yet paying taxes to meet its fixed requirements, the impulse toward repudiation may ripen into an insistent clamor. Once begun, it may spread like the virus of influenza, from nation to nation and from public to private obligations. Nothing could be more disastrous to a people than the success of such a movement, which will inevitably arise, whatever our policy. It is certain to materialize if in our financial administration we do not at all times apply sound principles to taxation and exercise a wise and frugal economy in expenditures. Nothing is more difficult in a republic than this if public interest is lax or nonexistent.

"Readjustments toward normal conditions must inevitably react on war prices and wages. The first will not be disturbing, the last may prove alarmingly so. Lowering of salaries and wages, though absolutely essential to a falling market, is always opposed by the wage earner and frequently to the extremes of violence. The higher these have risen the more bitter the opposition to their diminution becomes. This inevitable situation should be promptly recognized and every effort made to prepare against it. Labor should be urged to acquaint itself with the economic laws which compel the change and with its compensation in lowered cost of living. And the change should come as gradually and as universally as possible. These precautions may be taken without difficulty, with little trouble and with less expense. Their importance is self-evident. The most prejudiced and sometimes the most ignorant of men will listen to the persuasive influence of sympathetic discussion if interposed before their resentment becomes inflamed by a sense of injustice.

"Our immigration laws have been largely molded by political and economic considerations. The same is true of those relating to naturalization. Much of our immigration has represented the best of Europe. These have been of inestimable value to the country. They have cast their lot in America for all time, sharing our burdens and responsibilities and aiding in the great task of building a new nation upon a virgin continent.

"But the demand for labor and the need for ballots have flooded our shores with a mass of humanity apparently unsimilable. Politics bars only the Asiatic from our ports. Others are herded by trans-Atlantic steamship lines and delivered to our clamoring industries, which exploit their labor and neglect their souls. Their moral, material, and educational welfare receive scant consideration. They find no companionship beyond their own ranks, form themselves into racial groups, adhere to their national customs and language, learn nothing of American life or policies. They are as strangers within our gates, despised of employers and the public, doomed to the exactions of toil without lot or part in the land of their adoption. They measure our institutions, if they think of them at all, by the limited range of their unhappy experiences. Their conceptions of freedom and of citizenship can not be higher than their contact with the boss and the paymaster. They may at times inspire our curiosity or excite our distrust, but our sympathy and comradeship not at all. They attract the notice of political machines which encourage their naturalization to obtain their votes. This stamps the right to cast them as an asset of money value. They supply a rich and inviting soil for every social and economic fungus growth which hatred or ignorance may seek to propagate. Their colonies have become national plague spots, breeding places for all the ugly disorders of the century. They are dupes of the designing and the criminal, enemies of the established order ripening for revolt or revolution. They perceive all too easily the inequalities of society, the chasm between the very rich and the very poor, the power of combined wealth and the helplessness of the laws. Envy, hatred, neglect, the disdain of the community, and a blind sense of injustice, combine to inflame their animosities and expose their passions to suggestions of the torch and the sword as the sole arbiters of social and economic injustice.

"The disruption of the central powers, followed by the establishment of popular government for their liberated peoples, will doubtless remove all restrictions upon their continued emigration. The burden of debt, coupled with unsettled economic conditions, will encourage the western movement of their population. The added stimulus of the great steamship companies, eager for their old steerage traffic, may rapidly reestablish the high tide of antewar immigration. If it is to be checked, the dam must be erected on this side of the Atlantic, and no time should be lost in its construction.

"What are the dimensions of this evil? We are informed by the last census that our foreign-born population numbered 13,000,000 in 1910, or nearly one-eighth of the whole. Of these 6,000,000 were males of the voting age. The number attending English schools was very small. Most of them are packed in the crowded centers of our population. In this mighty city of prodigious contrasts are vast numbers of them. Every na-

tionality is represented, and their illiteracy is appalling. It has Italian colonies, Yiddish colonies, Russian colonies, Austrian colonies, Greek colonies. Your East Side is a vast mosaic of races, clannish, clinging to their native speech, strangers to our language, jealous of their own customs and disdaining ours. From Twenty-third Street south and First Avenue east there is nothing American. In that densely peopled region the English language is as lonely as the late Kaiser in Holland. Similar conditions may be found in Chicago, in Philadelphia, in Pittsburgh, in San Francisco, in nearly all the great cities. Save the struggle for existence these people have nothing in common with the native American.

"Your city typifies the general situation. It contains the germs of every social and political disorder. Part of its press are constant and competent sowers of sedition. Among these people class distinctions are magnified, and discontent and lawlessness encouraged. From such congenial soil was bred the Black Hand and the I. W. W., consecrated by their founders to pillage and murder. The red flag of anarchy is their symbol and war against the social order their shibboleth. A powder magazine unguarded, exposed to perils of accident or design, is not more dangerous to the community.

"Into the face of this sinister menace wealth flaunts the orgies of the great white way. It thus supplies the East Side with text and justification. A population, sullen with the discontent of poverty, confronted with the vulgar and ostentatious display of lavish extravagance, will not always remain quiescent. When the extremes of the Nation's social life jostle each other too harshly an explosion is inevitable. Such conditions can not endure. No government can be secure when the lives and tendencies of its people are essentially wrong.

"Bolshevism has given the world a hideous illustration of the fundamental truth that when liberty is divorced from law justice disappears. The freedom of unrestrained license is the only freedom of the mob. Under the sway of that many-headed despot crime holds high carnival. Robbery, rape, and murder are daily pastimes. The only authority is that of the strongest, and community life is transformed from a protection to a menace. It is to this chaos that international socialism would lead the world. Russian anarchy is popularly ascribed to the oppressions of the Romanoff dynasty, whose downfall shattered the foundation of the Empire. That is largely true. Yet it is a sinister fact that, excepting Lenin, nearly all the leaders of Russian bolshevism graduated from the swarming centers of New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia. Trotsky, Volodarsky, Vritzky, Martoff are some of them. Their bloody program was formulated here, and here they proposed to test it when opportunity beckoned, and Russia became their victim. From that continental slaughterhouse they salute their accessories in America and urge them to the commission of similar atrocities.

"The assimilation of races, so essential to a national unity, can not be effected under conditions now prevailing. While they continue our citizenship must be heterogeneous and discordant. A polyglot people, without geographical separation, with conflicting aims and ideals, united, yet socially, morally, and economically antagonistic, can not endure in a republic. Racial classification is the precursor of racial animosities, and racial animosities imperil the national safety.

"But our trend toward class distinctions is not wholly ethnological. It proceeds as well along other lines and finds expression in trades, in agriculture, in legislation. Our Federal laws bristle with clauses recognizing and favoring them. In matters of penalty, revenue, trusts, transportation, and appropriation we frequently exclude foreigners, workmen, Government employees, fraternal organizations, and some others from punitive and burdensome enactments. We also extend them privileges not conferred upon others less potential in numbers or influence. The equal protection of the laws will, if this practice be not abandoned soon, be honored more in the breach than the observance.

"The laws are potent for the protection and welfare of the citizen only as they are uniform in their application, just in their mandates, and respected by the people. Laxity in their enforcement and indifference to their requirements have long been a conspicuous and sinister feature of our national life. This is particularly true of the criminal law. The disparity between homicides and convictions will serve to illustrate the assertion. Their proportions are as 30 to 1, and those due to labor controversies seldom reach the stage of a formal indictment. The expense of modern litigation, crowded dockets, and the law's delays may be largely responsible for the low level of public respect for statutes and constitutions; but whatever the cause the evil is a serious one. The public safety depends upon the public order; the public order rests upon the sanction

and the mandate of the law; and the law is made contemptible whenever its protection is denied to the meanest citizen.

"To this condition we must plead guilty, for it is a melancholy fact that the citizen frequently is denied the equal protection of the laws, either by exposure without redress to acts of violence or through the tedious and expensive processes of legal machinery. Both mean a denial of justice, and Burke said that a government not founded on justice labored under the imputation of being no government at all.

"During the past four years Germany has met our protest against her many successive barbarities with the retort that lynchings and burnings in the South and promiscuous murder in our labor disputes were quite as shocking exhibitions of American methods in time of peace as her own atrocities in time of war. And we must concede in deep humiliation that in such things the two peoples occupy the same low level. This condition justified the President's protest to his fellow countrymen of last August:

"That every American who takes part in the action of a mob or gives it any sort of countenance is no true son of this great democracy, but its betrayer, and does more to discredit her by that single disloyalty to her standards of law and of right than the words of her statesmen or the sacrifices of her heroic boys in the trenches can do to make suffering peoples believe her to be their savior. * * * I can never accept any man as a champion of liberty either for ourselves or for the world who does not reverence and obey the laws of our own beloved land, whose laws we have ourselves made. He has adopted the standards of the enemies of his country, whom he affects to despise.

"Recent events show that the President's lofty rebuke has not been wholly effective, for in some communities mob murders have not ceased. Did they accomplish the end which is said to justify them, they would still be horrible. But the only effect is to prompt their repetition. And they are a hideous reproach upon Anglo-Saxon civilization.

"If our organic act means anything, every citizen is free to work according to his own desire. He should be subject only to the limitations of the law. To interfere with this right or permit others to do so with impunity is to undermine the foundations of our political structure. A law which does not throw the shield of its protection around him is worse than useless. It is a wanton delusion. On the other hand, ample punishment for the commission of crimes is provided and safeguards as well for the shielding of the innocent. All that is needed is their vigorous enforcement. If they are not applied, the fault is with the community much more than with the criminal. Let no man, therefore, justify his contempt for the law by pleading its nonenforcement. For that he is in part responsible.

"With all due allowance for considerations peculiarly applicable to the negro, he is entitled to the guardianship of the white man. His career has been a bitter one. He has been sinned against far more than sinning. He did not intrude himself upon us. He was brought here as a prisoner and slave. He earned his freedom 50 years ago by his devotion to his master's family in the dark period of our Civil War. He has since struggled upward against fearful odds. The great war gave him the opportunity to prove his devotion to his country, and well has he improved it. He has proved his loyalty to the flag under whose folds he has not always found protection. His blood, with ours, has consecrated the vast French battle ground from Chateau-Thierry to Sedan, and the armistice found him in the very vanguard of the western front. Surely such a record inspires our admiration, as it should command our gratitude. Who will deny that the negro has earned his right to the equal protection of his country's laws?

"Ours is a land of waste, and waste is the enemy of thrift. Some one has said that with our resources the French would have saved enough since the century began to pay her own and Britain's war expenses. The war has brought us the wisdom and the simplicity of thrift. We should make it a national virtue. It is the best cure for discontent, and grows with its practice. A thrifty man need make no search for something to relieve his needs. He has it. It is a fact of the highest significance that modern socialism discourages thrift. It is the foe of disorder; a virtue that becomes hostage to fortune. Hunger is stranger to it, and hunger never breeds reforms. Hunger breeds riot and bloodshed. The supernal wisdom of Jesus is clearly revealed to man in the Lord's Prayer, whose first supplication is, 'Give us this day our daily bread.'

"In America hunger is a social crime. Out of our abundance we can feed other continents. The fault lies in distribution. Food decays for lack of consumption in one section, while people starve for want of it in another. If private control of transportation can not solve the vital problem of its distribution public control must. If our railroads are inadequate, we must

construct more. If rates are prohibitive they must be lowered. Democracy requires food, and part of her mission is to secure it. "Corporate mismanagement and consolidations, huge issues of fictitious capital, corners in foodstuffs, manipulation of stock markets, fortunes realized overnight through financial jugglery, preponderant control of money and credits disfigured the commercial history of the two decades preceding our declaration of war. They constitute a sordid and humiliating chapter of greed and financial profligacy, and amply justify the wave of public disapproval, culminating in political revolt and codes of primitive legislation. Congressional and bureau investigations have disclosed sorry spectacles of mismanagement and of trusts betrayed by men of great wealth and commanding influence for their personal and financial aggrandizement. Public confidence in the integrity and patriotism of their class has been seriously impaired.

"These practices can not be too seriously criticized. They have inspired as they have justified every extreme of agitation. They have been condemned alike by radical and conservative. It is not too much to say that they have done more to inflame public sentiment, breed anarchy, and stir up socialist propaganda than any single influence of the century. It is the anarchy of capital. It is bolshevism in high life. Such operations can not be resumed if we hope to preserve free government in America. Otherwise than in the fortunate development of mines, great wealth may be suddenly acquired only through sinuous and criminal manipulation. Its frequent occurrence demoralizes the people. It begets discontent and compels imitation. The effort to get rich quick becomes infectious. Men look with disdain upon the slow but legitimate processes of accumulation and drift from plodding industry to the stock ticker and the exchanges. And as the vast majority of the seekers for sudden wealth are doomed to failure they will sooner or later join the ever-increasing army of the discontented and reproach the social order for their misfortunes.

"The well-to-do element of the country is its most influential class. It occupies the great domain of leadership and constructive development. It can ill afford to weaken the social and economic structure. It can not commit or countenance methods which breed discontent and unsettle confidence. It is the exponent, the guardian, and the director of material and financial integrity. Its position in the whole domain of the national activities is commanding. What it does or abstains from doing is therefore of great concern to the public and of prime importance to itself. When confidence in its honest or public spirit is impaired or overthrown the hour of upheaval will come. I therefore affirm that the suppression of the financial malversations so prevalent during the past quarter century is an insistent and overshadowing duty. Bolshevism and its kindred evils are their legitimate offspring. They supply the soap-box orator with his best ammunition and silence the protests of those who would eliminate him. You have purged life insurance of its financial sins. The bankers, merchants, manufacturers, and masters of traffic must profit by your example if indeed they have not already done so.

"Finally, the chasm between labor and capital must be spanned. This can not be done by force, by class resentments, nor by recrimination. It is a most serious problem, as it was before the war. Each of these great forces must understand the other's viewpoint. Both must realize that they are complements and coworkers of progress. Without the one the other is moribund. Neither can be discarded from the economies of trade and industry. Cooperation between them is indispensable to the public and private well-being. They must become partners in the largest sense, each exercising its legitimate functions for a common purpose. To assert this is a simple performance; to bring it about is a task for Titans. But it must be done.

"I have sketched in outline some of the difficulties with which the return of peace confronts us. The perspective is somber but not at all discouraging. Every generation has its tasks, and if ours is unduly burdensome its performance will place posterity under a larger obligation. Let us, therefore, one and all, clear the situation and strive to make our beloved country all that its ideals require. We must institute and enforce a rigid economy in public administration. We must unify our citizenship. We must have a common language with which all men and women must be made familiar. We must bring our institutions and traditions home to the understanding of everyone. We must extend the hand of sympathy and encouragement to every alien in the land, give him a stake in the country's affairs, and imbue him with the spirit of America. We must discourage the community life of the foreigner by teaching him the need for assimilation. We must require him to become naturalized within a fixed time after his arrival or return whence he came. We must

make him learn the English tongue and become reasonably familiar with the requirements of citizenship as a candidate of naturalization. The splendid type of soldier which these people have contributed to the war is a happy augury of what their development will be when our citizenship realizes and performs its full duty toward them. We must suppress all associations devoted to the commission of crime and the advocacy of disorder. We must radically change our immigration laws. We must have no ensign but the Stars and Stripes. We can have no companionship with the red flag of anarchy and revolution. We must assert and enforce the equal protection of the laws, do away with the mob, and gibbet the lyncher. We must teach the great truth that organized and ordered society is essential to man's existence and that protection of life and property is the basis of all governments worthy of the name. We must demonstrate that the strict observance of law is necessary alike to the happiness of nations and the security of communities. We must make treason odious. We must harmonize the discordant factions of industry and commerce. We must, if need be, forget party ties in the stress of tremendous obligation. We may each and all, faithful to our traditions and reverencing our ideals, struggle as Democrats and Republicans for the supremacy of our convictions, but we must remember that we are, above all, Americans, whose first and final duty is to perpetuate the welfare and shape the destiny of the great Republic. The ark of democracy's covenant was committed to Anglo-Saxon keeping long ago. Our fathers have proven worthy of the trust; we, too, must keep the faith. Henceforth the United States shall be a great training ground for the growth and development of a stalwart and genuine democracy."

THE REVENUE.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H. R. 12863, commonly known as the revenue bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 12863) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be taken up for the purpose of disposing of committee amendments first.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not object, provided it be understood that amendments that are objected to may go over for the present.

Mr. SIMMONS. That has always been the practice.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suppose it has been the practice; but I should like to have it understood by unanimous consent, since we are taking up the bill without reading.

Mr. SIMMONS addressed the Senate. After having spoken for some time,

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENDRICK in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 4637) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service.

Mr. POMERENE. Will the Senator from North Carolina yield to me just a moment?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. POMERENE. The unfinished business is here on a motion to reconsider the vote by which the substitute I proposed was adopted. I realize the importance, I think, of that bill and the much greater importance of the revenue bill, and as far as I am personally concerned I have not any desire to interfere with the revenue bill. I think it ought to have first place. At the same time I should like to have the motion to reconsider disposed of, but I am not willing that it shall be disposed of when there is less than a quorum here, and I do not want to have it disposed of at any time when I may not be here, because I shall have something to say upon the subject.

Mr. SIMMONS. Is the Senator through?

Mr. POMERENE. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. I desire to move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 12863, commonly known as the revenue bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12863) to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina will proceed.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah suggests the absence of a quorum, and the Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Baird	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Smoot
Bankhead	Kellogg	Page	Spencer
Borah	Kendrick	Penrose	Sterling
Calder	Kenyon	Polindexter	Sutherland
Chamberlain	King	Pollock	Swanson
Culberson	Kirby	Pomerene	Thomas
Curtis	La Follette	Ransdell	Thompson
Fletcher	Lenroot	Reed	Trammell
France	Lodge	Robinson	Underwood
Gay	McCumber	Saulsbury	Vardaman
Gronna	McKellar	Shafroth	Walsh
Harding	Martin, Va.	Sheppard	Warren
Hardwick	Mulkey	Simmons	Weeks
Henderson	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott
Johnson, Cal.	New	Smith, Md.	
Johnson, S. Dak.	Norris	Smith, Mich.	
Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Smith, S. C.	

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce the absence of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN] on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

I should also like to announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES] is detained from the Senate by illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] is absent owing to illness.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to state that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] is necessarily detained on official business.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SHIELDS] on account of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The Senator from North Carolina will proceed.

Mr. PENROSE. Before the Senator from North Carolina proceeds with his remarks, if I do not interrupt him too much, I should like to ask him what steps he has taken to have more copies of the bill printed, as well as the report of the committee? Besides, men all over the country want copies of the bill, and the supply is practically exhausted.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will state to the Senator that owing to the great size of the bill, comprising 278 pages, by Senate resolution we have been unable up to this time to get more than about 5,000 copies printed. I was contemplating introducing another Senate resolution for the printing of 5,000 more copies. If the Senator desires he may introduce such a resolution.

Mr. PENROSE. I am not particular about that, if the Senator wants me to do so. I should like to have included also copies of the report of the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. That can be done in a separate resolution.

Mr. SIMMONS. We will prepare such a resolution.

Mr. PENROSE. At the request of the chairman of the committee I will offer such a resolution, and I hope the Senator will offer a similar resolution for the printing of the report.

Mr. SIMMONS. I send the resolution to the desk and ask for its adoption.

The resolution (S. Res. 380) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 5,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 310, Sixty-fifth Congress, third session, entitled "Revenue bill of 1918," for the use of the Senate Committee on Finance.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from North Carolina if he will not prepare a concurrent resolution for the printing of 15,000 copies of the bill with the report? The demand from the House, I am told, is such that it has exhausted the 5,000 copies which have already been printed, with the Senate receiving only a very few copies of that number. I am informed that there is already a demand for about 10,000 copies of the report. That can not be supplied by a simple Senate resolution. I ask the Senator if he will not prepare a concurrent resolution providing that 15,000 additional copies shall be printed with the reports that have been made upon the bill.

Mr. PENROSE. I would suggest, as the chairman of the committee is overwhelmed, as we all know, with his task, that the Senator from Utah prepare the resolution and relieve the chairman to that extent.

Mr. SMOOT. I shall be very glad to prepare it.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will say that I conferred with Senators this morning about the preparation and introduction of a concurrent resolution for that purpose. If the Senator from Utah will be kind enough to prepare it and introduce it, I will agree to it.

Mr. SMOOT. I will do so in a very little while.

Mr. PENROSE. I should like to suggest in this connection that we ought to have 25,000 copies provided by the resolution the Senator from Utah is going to introduce.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think the Senator from Pennsylvania is correct. The demand for copies of the bill is very heavy.

Mr. PENROSE. Every cashier of every bank in the country and every business man has to have a copy of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. The reason why I suggested 15,000 copies was because we have already ordered by the Senate 10,000 copies, and that would make 25,000 copies. I base my statement for that number upon the fact that we had 25,000 copies of the bill of 1917 printed and they were not all distributed, and I thought perhaps 25,000 copies would be sufficient.

Mr. PENROSE. The taxes were very much lighter in the act of 1917. These taxes, in some cases satisfactory, are staggering, and the bill will be read much more carefully than any preceding act of Congress on internal-revenue legislation.

Mr. SMOOT. I will make the number in the resolution, then, 25,000.

Mr. PENROSE. As has been suggested by one of my colleagues near me, the taxpayer will probably wear out two or three copies before he understands it.

Mr. McCUMBER. I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill whether provision has been made for printing the views of the minority with the rest of the report?

Mr. SMOOT. I intend in the joint resolution to provide that the report of the majority, with the views of the minority, together with other views which may be offered, shall be printed in connection with the report.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understood that the resolution which was agreed to provided for the printing of 10,000 copies of the report, together with 10,000 extra copies, and I want to know whether the report as it will be printed under that resolution will contain the views of the minority.

Mr. SMOOT. I was only speaking of the resolution I intend to offer. It will provide for the printing of 25,000 copies of the bill and also for printing the same number of copies of each of the reports that has been made upon the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Is that all to be in one document, may I ask the Senator?

Mr. SMOOT. No, I will say that the concurrent resolution has not yet been offered to the Senate, but I have promised the Senator from North Carolina that I would prepare the resolution and offer it.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I should like to suggest that it would probably do better, for the purposes of a wide circulation, whatever purpose that may be, that it should be confined in the same resolution to the report and the bill, and let it go as one document; that instead of dividing it into four, five, or six parts, it should all be in one document. Then I think there would be no objection to the publication of it.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Let me make a suggestion to the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina has the floor. Does he yield?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Let me suggest to the Senator from Utah that the bill could easily be printed in the style of the report, that it would take a good deal less paper, and that it would be more convenient to have the majority report and the views of the minority and the bill all in one document. It seems to me everyone who will have the bill will want to see the report, and in that way it would be a saving of paper, and it seems to me it would facilitate the examination of the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Twenty-five thousand copies will be printed in the form the Senator indicates, as provided in the resolution passed a few days ago.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. There was some confusion in the Senate. I understood that the resolution provided for printing 10,000 copies of the bill and the report. If that is true and that has passed, then we will have a provision for the printing of 10,000 copies of the report without there being attached to the report the views of the minority. I wish information from the Chair about it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read the resolution.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 380), as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed 5,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 310, Sixty-fifth Congress, third session, entitled "Revenue bill of 1918," for the use of the Senate Committee on Finance.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then there has been no provision up to the present time for the printing of the report. I suggest to the chairman of the committee and the Senator from Utah, as has already been suggested by the Senator from Arizona, that in the

preparation of the document the report and the views of the minority be printed as a single document.

Mr. SIMMONS. I suggest that the Senator from Utah prepare it, and we will then see how it reads.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina will proceed.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] has indicated to me a desire to present some matter to the Senate, which he says will take him probably 20 or 25 minutes. I will yield to him for that length of time, as I am just a little weary now, and will then resume.

WOODEN-SHIP CONSTRUCTION.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I am obliged to the Senator from North Carolina for yielding. I did not want to interrupt the consideration of the pending bill, but since it suits his convenience for me to present this matter now, I will attempt to do so very briefly.

We have heard a good deal of discussion with regard to the construction of wooden ships, and there has been evidently, as it seems to me, a pronounced propaganda intended to discredit wooden ships very largely. There is also an indication that there have been more contracts let for the construction of wooden ships than the Shipping Board now feels it would be wise to carry out, and they are considering the cancellation of some of the contracts for wooden ships. I am not urging that any new contracts for wooden ships should be made by the Shipping Board. It is probable that the better type of ship is the steel ship and a larger ship than has been heretofore contemplated, and I am not proposing to interfere with that program; but I do insist that the wooden ships which have been constructed and the wooden ships which may be constructed are neither unseaworthy nor valueless, and I do insist that the shipyards of the country and the industry should not be abandoned or stifled by way of resorting to other methods of construction or by reason of this effort to discredit the wooden ship, and that if the Shipping Board itself concludes to build hereafter different forms or types of ship and confines its operation largely to steel, still there is work to do for the wooden-ship yards. For instance, we need tugs. I think experts generally will agree that the wooden tug is quite as standard and quite as valuable a boat as the steel tug, and in some instances it is superior to the steel tug. There is also needed wooden construction for pontoons or for building dry docks or for building smaller craft, and I do not want the impression to go out that the wooden-ship yards are to be wholly abandoned in this country and that that industry is to go to pieces. I have some views on that matter which I think it timely to suggest now. I shall be as brief about it as possible.

THE WOODEN SHIPS.

The well-known naval architect and marine engineer of New York, Mr. Theodore E. Ferris, says:

Ship property probably has more critics and less originality in its production than any other commercial constructive industry.

He gives reasons.

Some years ago the wooden ship was to a large extent discarded, superseded by steel vessels.

Then arose antagonisms to the wooden ships largely founded on prejudice, and there have been reasons operating against any correction of this prejudice. A great deal of misinformation has been added. There was strong opposition to the building of any wooden ships when the United States Shipping Board was hurrying to construct vessels which might serve the country in the hour of its greatest need. When, finally, it was announced that the board would build some wooden ships there was a storm of protest and dreadful predictions of failure filled the newspapers. It was in vain called to mind that for more than 2,000 years the wooden ship had sailed the seas, and the commerce of nations since the days of Tyre had largely depended upon wooden ships. To be sure, the large, modern passenger or cargo carrier built of steel is superior to the wooden vessel of approaching dimensions. But that the wooden vessel of smaller size, quick construction, whether sailer or steam, is a most useful and valuable vessel, standard in every way, there can be no possible doubt. Mr. Ferris designed a 3,500-ton wooden steam vessel and contracts were let to build them by the Emergency Fleet Corporation formed by the Shipping Board. There were some of the Hough type and some of the Dougherty type; in all 730 contracted for. They were laid down for emergency ships for oversea service and otherwise for general, all-around cargo business.

There have been delivered up to the 20th of November 98 of these wooden steamers completed. Of these, 76 have already carried cargoes or have sailed in ballast for loading ports. The others are being made ready for service; 367, including the 98

already referred to, have been launched. In addition to these 367, work has commenced on 193, and they are in partial frame or better. Contracts have been let, but work has not started, on 171. The Shipping Board has actually canceled 48 of these contracts and has authorized the cancellation of 100 more.

This has been done because it has been found that the board will have more of those ships than it can economically utilize, particularly when it takes into consideration the 400 steel ships built on the Great Lakes of about the same size and capacity.

No doubt, too, the board is influenced by the propaganda against wooden ships and the many false reports put in circulation concerning them, thus influencing the public mind to conclude that they are unseaworthy and almost worthless.

Some of the wildest, most absurd rumors have been put in circulation about them that could be conceived.

I have a complete list before me showing the record of each one of these ships which has been delivered.

The first one, *North Bend*, built by Kruse & Banks, of Coos Bay, Oreg., was immediately placed in the trade between the Pacific coast and the Hawaiian Islands, carrying general cargoes outward and sugar inward, first sailing from San Francisco to Honolulu June 3 last with coal. She sailed September 17 from San Francisco for New York with a general cargo, and from New York with general cargo for Cristobal November 2, arriving November 13.

The next one, *Bilosi*, built by Grant, Smith & Porter, St. Johns, Oreg., sailed the day she was delivered from Portland with lumber for San Francisco. Since then she has been operating between San Francisco and Honolulu until October 22, when she sailed for Chile, presumably to bring nitrates to Atlantic or Gulf ports.

These ships have been bringing coal on the Atlantic coast, nitrates from Chile, general cargoes on the Pacific coast to and from ports on the Pacific to ports on the Atlantic, lumber, sulphur, and other cargoes from the Gulf, coastwise, and, so far as I can learn, their performance is looked on with favor. Some of these ships have gone to dry dock for caulking, and one or two with rudder or engine trouble, but there has been no more of this than might be expected, no matter what the type of construction. So far as losses, beaching, and wrecking are concerned the facts are there have been just three total losses, to wit, the steamer *Coos Bay*, built by Kruse & Banks, foundered on September 11, 1918, during heavy weather, while bound from San Francisco to the west coast of South America in ballast; the steamer *Black Ford*, built by Gray's Harbor Motorship Co., was abandoned at sea during the same heavy weather of September 11 and drifted ashore on the west coast of Mexico on September 25. She was bound in ballast from San Francisco to the west coast of South America.

The steamer *Dumaru*, built by Grant, Smith & Porter, St. Johns, Oreg., while bound from the Pacific coast to the Philippines, was, in the vicinity of the island of Guam, struck by lightning on October 16, her cargo of oil exploded, and she was burned. This is the evidence of "unseaworthiness"—three losses, two from storm and one from lightning, since last June.

I think we should be governed by the facts. What we want is the truth. No matter whether that be favorable or unfavorable, good or bad, the truth should be known. We are in a position to know the facts because these ships have been in actual operation. They have actually been carrying dry and perishable cargoes. They have been operating successfully. Whether they have been operating economically and make a good business showing I have not complete data to prove. That can be supplied undoubtedly by the Shipping Board.

It has been announced that the board is willing to sell some of these ships because they are not required for any particular service. Can that be the reason for denunciation of them and the studied effort to discredit them? Be that as it may, a responsible party, an experienced ship operator, tells me that he is ready to buy a few of them at \$725,000 each.

They are not adapted to trans-Atlantic service, where it is necessary to bunker for the round trip. The coal they would be obliged to carry would take up too much space and reduce too much the space for cargo. They are not of excessive draft. They weigh no more, equipped, than the steel ships which carry water ballast. They perform equal to the steel ships under like conditions. They are intended to operate overseas and to the West Indies, carrying all sorts of commodities, dead-weight cargo, such as sugar, cement, nitrates, coal; and being of the well-deck type, deck loads can be carried, such as barreled goods, structural steel, cars, boilers, machinery, lumber, and wood in the wells.

The well-deck or three-island type of ship, which these are, has been accepted by the merchant marine of the world as the

all around most useful cargo ships, as Mr. Ferris claims. The Norwegians, who rank among the most expert ship operators, have adopted them almost universally. This is largely true of British owners.

Of course, vessels may be wanted for specific trades for which these would not be suitable.

For instance, if it is desired to carry bulk cargoes of large cubic and small dead-weight such as package freight, like cotton, with no deck load, you would want a different kind of ship. The cubic ship would be best for that service.

If it is desired to make full cubic ships out of these vessels, that could be accomplished at any time by closing in the wells.

They can be made complete two-deck vessels by closing in the forward well.

The cargo capacity could be increased by placing the machinery aft, instead of amidships, but this would not be advisable when the service is to be ocean service. Mr. Ferris favors a larger ship of this type. It is conceivable that heavy engines, racing in a rough sea, might shake, strain, loosen up the parts, and tend to rack a big ship of wooden construction. Certainly, however, wooden construction up to, say, 350 feet keel has been thoroughly demonstrated to have real merit and unquestioned value and is approved by all of the maritime nations of the world.

What I complain of is the effort to stifle or destroy an important industry in this country when there is no reason or sense in such a course.

Shall every wooden-ship yard of the country be put out of business because of this absurd and false propaganda, to the effect that the wooden ship is a failure and no more wooden construction should be allowed? We have the material and now the trained workmen, the well-equipped yards. Are these to be utilized, an extensive and highly important industry maintained, or, by reason of prejudice, ignorance, or misrepresentations, these resources, facilities, and opportunities must be wasted and abandoned?

Any other nation with the slightest appreciation of what the use of the sea means would rejoice and take full advantage of such material and facilities. Surely we will not be so blind or prodigal as to discard them. Foreign countries will keep our wooden yards busy if we will permit them to do so. Shall we play the dog in the manger, reject wooden construction, and then say our builders shall not construct for foreign account? In my judgment, we should build wooden tonnage for Americans and for foreign account, and remove all unnecessary war restrictions upon operation. The sooner this policy is adopted the better.

Mr. President, I have submitted some of the criticisms which have come to me, which have been reported in the newspapers, and which have been founded upon rumors largely to Mr. Ferris, the well-known expert and naval architect of New York, who designed the 3,500-ton Ferris type of wooden ship which was adopted by the Shipping Board. I have his reply to some of those rumors and reports which I formulated and submitted to him, which I desire to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. I submit his letter of September 27 and also his letter of December 4.

I have also a statement from the Shipping Board, entitled "Performance of the 98 wooden steamships delivered to the Emergency Fleet Corporation up to November 21, 1918." I should like to have that also inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection to the request of the Senator, and permission to do so is granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

NEW YORK, September 27, 1918.

HON. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,
Chairman Committee on Commerce, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FLETCHER: Your interesting letter of the 14th instant was duly received, and I have not replied before this date owing to absence.

The criticism set forth by the shipbuilder and operator that has called on you, and these criticisms as you have frankly stated them to me are indeed somewhat sweeping.

I do not know if you are aware that ship property probably has more critics and the least originality in its production than any other commercial constructive industry, this because of the diversities of the trades in which the ships are employed, difference in commodities carried, and methods of loading and discharging not at all common to the various commodities transported. That is, the cargo ship that comes nearest being common to all trades is what is known as the well-deck, or three-island, type of ship. While in the line business, the ships are more or less of a specific type and character for the service in which they are to be engaged. Further, great pride usually connected with the design and building of ships tends in the main to cultivate criticism and jealousy. Also we find that most everybody that has to do with ships feels they know all about them, both as to design, construction, and operation, and proper types for specific trades,

whereas the facts are, as the past has shown, the worst failures are where the owner and operator thought he knew the design and construction and dictated it; in other words, was the homemade naval architect. The results with the ships thus produced has proven that little knowledge was dangerous.

For the past 15 years in my work in designing and building of merchant vessels it is conceded I have had more experience than any other one person in learning the requirements and coping with the steamship operators, and the facts are I have yet to experience a failure with a merchant vessel. There is ample record of the ships turned out at my hands, both as to number of ships and types.

To point out how opinions will differ as to what is proper and correct in a ship for a specific trade: For some seven years past a large steamship interest with subsidiary operating companies, each one managed separately by its president, I have endeavored, without success, to get them to agree on one standard cargo ship that would in their opinion meet the requirements of all. Up to the present time this is a failure and seems to be impossible. Two of the subsidiary companies handle bulk freight carried under decks. The other two subsidiary companies carry dead-weight cargoes and deck loads and are more or less in the line of tramping business.

Now, as to the wooden ship, I do not know if you fully appreciate—and which is probably because of the wooden ship having been discarded; that is, practically superseded by steel vessels some years ago—the trouble in maintenance of the wooden ship experienced by some of the old school of operators. To bring the wood ship back now and have it looked upon with favor is a difficult matter. We all know how difficult it was to get owners to believe in the iron ships when they first came into existence, and this we are now in a way repeating with the wood ships. There exists to an extent an antagonism against the wood ship which to a great degree is prejudice and a great deal is assumed without fact. For instance, a wood ship goes into dry dock and the critics just seem to feel free to say it was because she is leaking or had some structural weakness that caused her to leak, or other similar defect made up to nourish assumptions already founded on false premises and their expectations of what the wood ship was going to be.

It has plainly come to my realization—perhaps more so on account of being unaccustomed to it—that in a national matter where public money is being spent there seemingly is great criticism. Everyone would have done different, has different ideas, suggestions, and results than the fellow who was called upon to do it. No matter how faithfully the work had been done, he would be wrong in the eyes of these people. It seems to me, and in this I am sure you will concur—that you should know the real facts about these wooden ships. Never mind whether the facts indicate good or bad, the actual truth is what I am sure you want. Opinions and criticisms are numerous and in the same category as offered advice, which, according to the old saying, the latter usually has a bad odor. These opinions have no place in the premises; actual facts and the truth is the only matter to be considered with the proving up of these ships in actual operation, whether or not they will carry dry and perishable cargo, operate economically, and show themselves to be a good commercial proposition.

Section 1 of your letter states: "That there are five wooden ships, Ferris type, completed and started out for business. They are now somewhere in dry docks between Beaumont and Boston. Each one of them proves a practical failure."

The facts are, in accordance with information I have, there are to date, or, rather, as I understand it September 15, 353 ships, including requisitioned ships completed, a total of about 2,110,000 dead-weight tons. Of these 353 ships 41 are of wooden construction, and out of the 41 wooden ships I should say, approximately, 30 of them are of the "Ferris" type. Of this number some 15 or 20 are from Atlantic coast and Gulf yards and are now in service or practically ready to start on a voyage, certain ones having already made complete voyages. There have been to date, so far as I know, none of these ships pronounced as "practical failures." Quite to the contrary, their performance is looked upon with more or less favor, these about the facts and the above-quoted statement is quite untrue.

Section 2 of your letter states: "They leak so badly they have been obliged to put in dry docks and were found to have from 2 to 10 feet of water in them."

It is my understanding that each and every ship completed at the finishing yard was ordered to be dry-docked, to be given the once over, and see that they were all right before going to sea. In fact, this procedure is not uncommon in any and all vessels. There are exceptions, however, in the case of steel ships, where they are finished and go to sea without a docking before proceeding to sea.

In some cases, in fact I might say a number of cases, as I understand the situation, several of the ships being the first built and going through the pioneer work of the first building, have when on the dry dock had some work done on them; more fastening or original fastening put in around stern. These ships, as you know, are single screw, and when racing in a seaway the fastening around the stern must be of a most secure nature.

The keels of practically all these ships were laid purposely with a sag of about 6 inches. While I do not know the details, I hear that one of the ships when docked was laid on straight keel blocks, which, of course, straightened her out and caused her to leak. There has been some few cases where the ships leak some. This was due only to caulking and not from any other cause except the one above mentioned. As to any of the ships having 10 feet of water in them, I believe this is absolutely untrue. Anyone making such a statement, I think, ought to be called upon to produce the facts.

Section 3 of your letter states: "That they are excessively heavy and of excessive draft. The timbers are too large and too numerous in them, and the material in them has not been properly distributed, both as to the wood and the steel."

The facts are that none of these ships are of excessive draft over what they were originally intended to be. Quite to the contrary, from information I have, they carry an excess of the intended dead weight about 200 tons and they trim properly under light conditions. That is, they draw a sufficient amount of water aft that propeller wheel is properly immersed, so as to perform at sea without ballast. Would explain right here that a wood ship has no means for water ballast; that is, double bottom similar to steel vessels, to put them down when light. It is obvious, therefore, that a wood ship's increased weight—that is, weight of the equipped ship over that of a steel ship—about makes up the weight of water ballast in a steel ship. The wood ship, if of proper model and trim, will perform equal to the steel ship under light condition—the steel ship with water ballast and the wood ship with no ballast—provided the machinery is placed amidships in the latter.

I can appreciate that to anyone looking at these ships under light conditions they may appear to be of excessive draft. But anyone who is not from the Lakes and has actually had experience in operating ships in ocean service knows or should know fully this condition.

As to the timbers in this ship being too large and too numerous and the material not properly distributed, the facts are the instructions in designing these vessels were that they were to perform in ocean service. Please understand this statement takes no account as to whether the ships are large enough for overseas service. Further, received instructions that they were to receive the highest class of the American Bureau of Shipping. The Classification Society is in the main responsible for the size of timbers, number and distribution of material. It is my judgment, however, and it always has been, that if these ships are going to operate overseas and some of them, say, to the West Indies carrying all sorts of commodities, I mean dead-weight cargo, such as sugar, cement, etc., that their construction is not too heavy especially in the pioneer wood-ship building, where something has to be allowed in this respect to offset some inferior workmanship, fastening, etc., and especially in cases where the ship is built of soft wood; that is, we class yellow pine as soft wood.

It is true considerable timber could be cut out in the way of shelf logs were it possible to obtain knees in place of them. If these ships were for moderate coastwise service only and for package-freight service, such as on the Great Lakes, their scantlings could probably be reduced to some extent, and might to a moderate degree in the present situation when the builders become more skilled in the fitting and fastening of timbers. For anyone only acquainted with wood-ship building on the Lakes, where oak is universally used, to them no doubt the scantlings of yellow pine appear too large and numerous.

Section 4 of your letter states: "That comparatively slight changes in design would give a ship at a saving of 20 per cent in material, at a saving of that much in the cost, 20 per cent of the cost, at an increase of cargo capacity of something like 25 per cent."

I can not imagine how a slight change in the design can possibly effect a 20 per cent saving in material unless the classification societies requirements for scantlings was abandoned or unless a different grade of timber was used; for instance, oak instead of soft wood or yellow pine. In this type of construction little can be done in reducing scantlings and still meet the requirements of the classification societies. It is a fact, however, that a considerably larger ship could be built with no great material increase in scantlings. If a type of construction was adopted, such as diagonal wood strapping, the majority of the yards building these ships could not have done the work.

As to increased cargo capacity, this is simply a matter of type. To explain, if the machinery was placed in the stern of these ships similar to Lake practice, the after well closed in there would be gain in cubic capacity by eliminating the shaft tunnel and using part of the after-peak tank for auxiliaries and a further gain due to closing the after well. This would result in increased draft of the ships under free-board regulations and in return increased dead weight. The cubic capacity could be further increased by closing in the forward well and making them complete two-deck vessels. The present ships were not laid down without due consideration of the above and without due consideration of the losses against the gains. Further, the machinery could be retained amidships and the wells closed in and thus increased cubic and dead-weight capacity would be gained.

Now, as for a wood ship with machinery placed aft for ocean service—that is, a coal burner, which she must be, because it is not possible to carry fuel oil in wood hulls without enormous expense in providing metal tanks. Such a ship, due to weight of machinery and coal bunkers in the stern, I claimed from the start would not perform satisfactorily in ocean service, and have no reason to retract from this. The strains on the ship are too enormous; due to bunkers burning out with no ballast tanks to pump up, trim can not be maintained, and performance is decidedly unsatisfactory.

The flush-deck vessel for general cargo service on the Lakes is looked upon with favor, but for service to the West Indies, and, in fact, overseas, the well-deck type of ship has stood up against them all, having the ability to carry all kinds of cargo up to density of 60 cubic feet per ton, and in addition has sufficient stability to take care of a deck load. Lake operators know little or nothing about deck loads, which have become more and more permanent in our American cargo ships for service to the West Indies, etc. Barreled goods, structural steel, cars, boilers, machinery, and such commodities, including lumber and wood, are carried in wells of these ships as deck loads, which the flush-deck ship can not get away with.

Section 5 of your letter states: "Particularly the heavy keelsons running parallel on both sides of the main keel and extending some 3 feet up in the ship would necessarily interfere greatly with the discharge of cargo and are considered as being unnecessary."

It is true these girder keelsons are of some slight obstruction, but a statement that they are some 3 feet up in the ship is absolutely untrue. The fact is they extend up in the ship 16 inches and are put there for strength.

Further referring to section 5: "All the heavy timbers he considers are much too large." "He does not believe the ships will be of material value as a part of our mercantile marine. The machinery and furnishings are superb. The hull is of a design which builders discarded in 1882, but in less than a week the design could be altered so as to effect the advantages and economies mentioned."

I have made mention in the foregoing regarding the heavy timbers, and as for the ships being no material value in our mercantile marine, this can only be answered as time goes on. Their operation will have to prove this. If they show they can carry dry and perishable cargo and operate economically, then if they are not of any value it is because of two things, bad management in operation or units too small to be profitable. As to the design being discarded in 1882, do not know just what is meant by this; if it is the type of ship, would state that it has never been discarded. The well deck, or Three Island type of ship, which these ships are, have been accepted by the merchant marine of the world as the all around most useful cargo ship. The Norwegians, who rank among the keenest of ship operators in the world, have adopted them almost universal. Except as to some modifications, this also applies to English owners, who in some cases adopted long poops or quarter-decks, and in all cases the machinery is placed amidships. While it is true alterations could be made to the design, but as it affects materials ordered and the whole program of construction, vast time in delay and confusion can not other than but occur.

Permit me to make it clear that when these ships were laid down the distinct understanding was that they would be emergency ships for overseas service, and otherwise for general all-around cargo business. If it is now contemplated that the vessels as a whole or certain ones of them be employed in specific trades, for instance, the carrying of bulk cargoes

of large cubic and small dead weight, such as package freight coastwise, cotton, etc.—no deck loads—their type is not especially adapted to this sort of business. For this service what is known as a cubic ship is best. The criticisms that have been made as to the capacity of these vessels can not be in common sense unless the party has distinctly in mind the employment of the ships in a specific service of this character.

Your reference that "since these five ships are in the water and actual experience with them has taught something, do you not think it would be well to look one of them over some time soon and consider the design further and any possible changes"? Beg to say I have followed the wooden ships as well as the steel ships because of my great interest and strenuous efforts in behalf of the Government. Of course, having no official connection, it is not possible to know a great deal in detail. On about September 3 I went over the wood ship *Alcázar* while she was here in New York and am inclosing you copy of letter written Mr. James O. Heyworth, manager Division of Wood Ship Construction, at that time as a result of my inspection of this ship.

I think you should have any and all information that might be of interest or bears on the facts. However, may I ask that you kindly treat the letter as confidential? I have no interest in the whole matter except honest work and dealings in my profession at my hands, realizing years ago that no other can be lasting.

In the case of the *Alcázar* it is interesting to know that while I was around the dock previous to going aboard there were reports circulating that she had 2 feet of water in her. I mention this to point out what I referred to in the first part of this letter. The fact is, as I verified it, the ship had not been leaking. She did go to dry dock, however, to take her rudder off and fit on it a reinforcing strap, but for no work on account of leaking.

In connection with my reference to the performance of these wooden ships, it is my understanding that 24 of them have been assigned for a voyage to Chile to bring back nitrate and about 15 out of the 24 are of the standard "Ferris" type. A cargo of nitrate will be an excellent test, provided the ships get in a good stress of weather on the return voyage. When these ships arrive at the Atlantic ports we will then know how they can stand up to their work.

I understand from recent reports that one of the Hough type of ships has foundered at sea off the Pacific coast. This is the ship of straight timber construction that was so much agitated in the early part of the wood-ship program. I am inclosing certain letters which dealt with that class of ship at that time, which perhaps you would be interested to note.

In closing, would say that it is my view, because of the experience gained in wood-ship construction, if the building of wood vessels is to be continued, a larger ship should be adopted. In the main, I believe it would be unwise to entertain any alterations to the present 3,500-ton wooden ships, for no specific gain can be made unless classification is waived or some of the ships are wanted for specific bulk freight trade, as I have referred to. In fact, if it is desired to make full cubic ships out of them, this could be accomplished at any future time by closing in the wells.

Respectfully, yours,

THEO. E. FERRIS.

NEW YORK, December 4, 1918.

HON. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER, Esq.,
Chairman Committee on Commerce,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FLETCHER: I regret the delay in replying to your favor of the 29th ultimo, which was due to my absence. Have received in this morning's mail copy of your statement on the wooden ship, which I think is exceedingly good, and it was thoughtful of you to send copy of same to me.

You refer to report you have from the board which shows rumors that "the ships are failures; they leak, have engine trouble, rudders must be replaced with steel or iron; a lot of them beached and others in dry dock, etc., etc." and you mention that such rumors are basely false. They are not only false but certainly harmful in a national matter, and those who will indulge in them are not truthful, have little interest in actual facts, and bent on circulating criticism. I do not suppose you could ever get any steel-ship builder to see any good whatever in wooden ships.

You ask for permission to use, if you discuss the matter in the Senate, my letter of September 27. I have no objections to this at all, except, of course, the confidential portions where same might possibly involve some other persons, and naturally I would want to see this avoided. So far as I am concerned, would greatly appreciate keeping out of any possible controversy, but would not shirk one if facts and truth were at stake.

You ask if I have any later facts as to operations, seaworthiness and commercial business showing they have made. Regret to say I have nothing more than general information. The ships that came from South America with nitrate I understand did very good work; in fact, seem to prove that none of the standard wood ships thus far have shown the slightest structural weakness. In fact, quite to the contrary, and some of them have been in pretty heavy weather.

It is correct, as I get the information from the American Bureau of Shipping, that there has been some trouble with rudder stocks, which was partly due to not having obtained the best material for them and partly on account of steering gear overrunning and putting improper twist on the stocks. I had some correspondence with Mr. Heyworth about this, and inclose copies of the letters, which are self-explanatory.

I telephoned to-day to the marine superintendent of one of the operating companies that has 16 of the wooden ships—14 of the standard type and 2 of the Hough type. Twelve of these ships have been running between New York and Galveston and there are 4 not quite ready yet. These 12 ships that have been running between New York and Galveston are carrying general cargo, and some of them, in addition to running to Galveston, have gone over to the West Indies. This marine superintendent, who certainly is a capable judge, tells me that the ships are doing very good work, have absolutely no structural weakness, and are staunch in every respect. In some cases they have had caulking to do on the ships, but that this was to be expected. He also says the ships load and discharge cargo very satisfactorily.

I also have information from the Pacific coast, where several of the ships there have carried sugar cargoes between Honolulu and San Francisco. A sugar cargo is a very particular one, for a small amount of water usually results in considerable damage, as it penetrates through the bags of sugar and the bags are thrown out and classed as damaged cargo. I understand there was no damage in these sugar cargoes. Therefore these ships could not have leaked very much.

You inquire as to what is the length of the keel in the Ferris type 3,500-ton ship. Beg to say these ships are 268 feet on the keel.

Your mention that one correspondent is inclined to limit wooden construction to 220 feet keel length is interesting, and can only say, if this correspondent really believes this, he is not conversant with wood-ship building as we now know it.

During my connection with the Government shipbuilding program, and that part in connection with the wooden ships, believe I came in contact with pretty much all the various proposed methods of construction. Also made quite a study of what had been done in wooden-ship building. Not only did I meet and converse with practically all the wooden-ship builders of the country but also have gone among the yards on the Gulf and Atlantic coasts and also on the Pacific coast.

While I dislike to say so, I must confess that the old tradition wood-ship builders of this country—they were few—represent the great diversity of opinion as to proper wood-ship construction, and certainly were a self-opinionated lot of men. Really based on what we have proven in the Government wooden-ship-building program, these men did not know the fundamental engineering principles entering into a vessel built of wood. In laying down the Government ships flat floor—that is, without much dead rise—so as to get floor timbers without butts, throw girder load from bilge to bilge, and systematically steel-strapping the ships, we have produced the only wooden ships ever built in this country that have not shown any tendency to hog, or rather push the bottom up. Further, the wood-ship-building regimen that came from the Pacific coast at the beginning of the Government shipbuilding program emphatically stated that sternposts and deadwoods could not be constructed of wood to hold a single-screw arrangement, and it was their idea that all self-propelled wood vessels would necessarily have to be twin screw. In the standard Government wood ships, which are single screw, the sternposts and deadwoods are standing up admirably, and the racing of the larger propeller wheel has not shown any bad effects thus far with these ships. Further, the universal claim that propelling machinery in a wooden ship, due to vibration, would rack and loosen the vessel's hull is not the case. The ships show no sign whatever of any trouble in this respect.

Of course the wood ship can not commercially be put on a parallel with the steel ships. I say commercially because a wood ship weighs about 15 per cent in excess of steel vessels of equal dimensions, or carries 15 per cent less cargo with the same amount of propelling power expended. Their upkeep and maintenance are somewhat more, but for any person or body of men to contend that because a ship is built of wood she is a failure and is of no commercial value is ridiculous and can only be based on purely prejudiced deductions.

My great regret with the Government wood ship is that we were allowed to be a little too much influenced by the so-called practical wood-ship builder, who, as it has turned out, did not even know the fundamental principles. By their influence we limited the size of the ship to 268 feet long, and I now feel absolutely sure that just as satisfactory a wood ship can be built up to 320 feet long of 5,000 to 5,500 tons dead-weight carrying capacity, which in unit size is very much more attractive than the 3,500-ton wood ship and would do well overseas. It is also to be regretted that these wood ships could not have been fitted with Scotch boilers instead of water-tube boilers, the latter being forced upon us because of the emergency and the stated impossibility to get boiler plates, furnaces, and tubes, together with the necessary facilities to produce Scotch boilers. This, in fact, applies to many of the steel ships, and I do not believe, and never did, that the water-tube boiler will be a permanent thing in any cargo ship, the Scotch boiler being practically the only one for this class of ship.

Respectfully, yours,

CHAS. E. FERRIS.

PERFORMANCE OF THE 98 WOODEN STEAMSHIPS DELIVERED TO THE EMERGENCY FLEET CORPORATION UP TO NOVEMBER 21, 1918.

[Compiled by David L. Ewins, Assistant Director of Operations, United States Shipping Board, Emergency Fleet Corporation, Washington, D. C., November 22, 1918.]

WOODEN SHIPS DELIVERED TO EMERGENCY FLEET CORPORATION.

North Bend (Hough type). Builders, Kruse & Banks, North Bend, Ore. Delivered May 27, 1918. Sailed from San Francisco June 3 for Honolulu with coal; arrived June 18. Sailed from Honolulu June 23 for San Francisco with sugar; arrived July 5. Sailed from San Francisco July 26 for Honolulu with general cargo; arrived August 5. Sailed from Honolulu August 14 for San Francisco with sugar; arrived August 27. Sailed from San Francisco for New York September 17 with general cargo; arrived October 18. Sailed from New York November 2 for Cristobal with general cargo; arrived November 13.

Bilori (Hough type). Builders, Grant, Smith & Porter, St. Johns, Ore. Delivered June 26, 1918. Sailed from Portland June 26 for San Francisco with lumber; arrived June 29. Sailed from San Francisco July 16 for Honolulu with general cargo; arrived July 27. Sailed from Honolulu August 8 for San Francisco with sugar; arrived August 21. Sailed from San Francisco September 8 for Honolulu with general cargo; arrived September 19. Sailed from Honolulu September 25 for San Francisco with general cargo; arrived October 7. Sailed from San Francisco October 22 for Arica in ballast.

Wasco (Hough type). Builders, Grant, Smith & Porter, St. Johns, Ore. Delivered June 30, 1918. Sailed from Astoria July 1 for San Francisco with lumber; arrived July 4. Sailed from San Francisco July 17 for Honolulu with general cargo; arrived July 28. Sailed from Honolulu August 2 for San Francisco with sugar; arrived August 20. Sailed from San Francisco September 6 for Honolulu with general cargo; arrived September 17. Sailed from Honolulu September 25 for San Francisco with general cargo; arrived October 5. Sailed from San Francisco October 22 for Chile in ballast; arrived November 17.

Quidnic (Hough type). Builders, Kruse & Banks, North Bend, Ore. Delivered June 30, 1918. Sailed from San Francisco July 7 for Honolulu with general cargo; arrived July 19. Sailed from Honolulu July 24 for San Francisco with general cargo; arrived August 5. Sailed from San Francisco August 18 for Honolulu with general cargo; arrived August 29. Sailed from Honolulu September 1 for San Francisco with sugar; arrived September 17. Sailed from San Francisco September 25 for Honolulu with general cargo; arrived October 6. Sailed from Honolulu October 13 for San Francisco with sugar and pineapples; arrived October 25.

Kasota (Hough type). Builders, Grant, Smith & Porter, St. Johns, Ore. Delivered June 30, 1918. Sailed from Portland July 5 for San Francisco in ballast; arrived July 14. Sailed from San Francisco July 29 for Honolulu with general cargo; arrived August 9. Sailed from Honolulu September 12 for San Francisco with sugar; arrived September 26. Sailed from San Francisco October 25 for Honolulu with general cargo; arrived November 6. Sailed from Honolulu November 8 for Manila.

Wishkah (Grays Harbor type). Builders, Grays Harbor Mercantile Ship Corporation, Grays Harbor, Wash. Delivered June 30, 1918. Found to be leaking. Sailed from Seattle September 2 for Honolulu with lumber; arrived September 14. Sailed from Honolulu October 20 for San Francisco with sugar; arrived October 31.

Quinault (Ferris type). Builders, Seaborn Shipyards, Tacoma, Wash. Delivered July 7, 1918. Sailed from Seattle July 9 for San Francisco. Sailed from San Francisco July 24 for Honolulu with general cargo; arrived August 1, 1918. Sailed from Honolulu August 11 for San Francisco. Ran out of coal 250 miles out. Towed in by *Point Lobos*. Arrived at San Francisco August 24, 1918. Sailed from San Francisco September 14 for Honolulu with general cargo; arrived September 23. Sailed from Honolulu October 2 for San Francisco with general cargo and sugar; arrived October 11.

Blandon (Hough type). Builders: Grant, Smith, Porter Ship Co., St. Johns, Ore. Delivered July 17, 1918. Sailed from San Francisco July 27, 1918, for Portland with general; arrived July 30. Sailed from Astoria August 8 for San Francisco with general; arrived August 12. Sailed from San Francisco August 15 for Portland with general; arrived August 18. Sailed from Portland August 23 for San Francisco with general; arrived August 26. Sailed from San Francisco September 1 for Astoria with general; arrived September 6. Sailed from Astoria September 11 for San Francisco with general; arrived September 15. Sailed from San Francisco September 19 for Portland with general; arrived September 23. Sailed from Portland September 23 for San Francisco with general; arrived October 5. At San Francisco dry docking October 5. Sailed from Astoria October 16 for San Francisco with general; arrived October 25. Sailed from San Francisco October 26 for Portland with general; arrived October 29. Sailed from Portland November 5 for San Francisco with general; arrived November 7. Sailed from San Francisco November 14 for Portland with general; arrived November 18.

Boilston (Hough type). Builders: Grant, Smith & Porter, St. Johns, Ore. Delivered July 26, 1918. Sailed from Portland July 27 for San Francisco in ballast; arrived July 31. Sailed from San Francisco August 7 for Honolulu with general; arrived August 18. Sailed from Honolulu for island ports September 1 with general; arrived September 10. Sailed from San Francisco September 24 for New York with sugar. Sailed from San Francisco October 2 for Baltimore with quartermaster supplies; arrived Balboa October 20. Sailed from Cristobal October 21 for Baltimore with general; arrived October 31. Sailed from Baltimore November 12 for Philadelphia with ballast; arrived November 15. Sailed from Philadelphia November 21 for Houston with general.

Kaskaskia (Grays Harbor type). Builders: Grays Harbor M. S. Corporation, Grays Harbor, Wash. Delivered July 27, 1918. Sailed from Hoquiam July 27 for Seattle; arrived Seattle dry dock August 2. Sailed from Seattle August 11 for Comox, British Columbia, with ballast. Sailed from Union Bay August 17 for Honolulu with coal; arrived August 29. Sailed from Honolulu September 10 for San Francisco with sugar; arrived September 19. Sailed from San Francisco October 8 for Honolulu with general; arrived October 17. Sailed from Honolulu October 23 for San Francisco with general; arrived November 2. Sailed from San Francisco November 15 for New York with Navy canned goods.

Kickapoo (Hough type). Builders: Kruse & Banks, North Bend, Ore. Delivered July 29, 1918. Sailed from San Francisco August 6 for Honolulu. Returned to San Francisco—rudder trouble. Sailed from San Francisco August 9 for Honolulu with general; arrived August 21. Sailed from Honolulu September 2 for San Francisco with pineapples; arrived September 20. Sailed from San Francisco October 16 for Arica with ballast; arrived San Diego October 18 for repairs. Sailed from San Diego October 25 for Arica, repairs completed; arrived Arica November 15; arrived Caleta Caloso November 16.

Coyote (Ferris type). Builders: Foundation Co., Newark, N. J. Delivered August 1, 1918. Sailed from New York August 16 for Norfolk with general; arrived August 18. Arrived Bermuda August 28; grounded at Bermuda September 9, 1918; arrived Norfolk September 17 light. Sailed from Norfolk September 29 for Providence with coal; arrived October 1. Sailed from Providence October 16 for Norfolk with ballast; arrived November 18. Sailed from Norfolk October 22 for ———; arrived Norfolk October 24 with cargo coal.

Wahkiakum (Ferris type). Builders: Seaborn Shipyards, Tacoma, Wash. Delivered August 2, 1918. Sailed from Seattle August 14 for Honolulu with general; arrived September 2. Sailed from Honolulu for San Francisco September 8 with sugar; arrived September 18. At San Francisco repairing September 27. Sailed from San Francisco October 19 for Honolulu with general; arrived October 31.

Callooh (Hough type). Builders: Grant, Smith & Porter Ship Co., St. Johns, Ore. Delivered August 7, 1918. Sailed from Portland August 7 for San Francisco with lumber; arrived San Francisco August 10. Sailed from San Francisco August 20 for New York with general; arrived September 20. Sailed from New York October 2 for Norfolk with ballast; arrived October 4. Sailed from Norfolk October 13 for Habana with coal; arrived October 17. Sailed from Habana October 20 in ballast; arrived at Galveston October 24; arrived at New York November 4. Sailed from New York November 9 for Brunswick with general; arrived November 13.

Moritz (Hough type). Builders: Grant, Smith & Porter Ship Co., St. Johns, Ore. Delivered August 12, 1918. Arrived at San Francisco August 17 with general. Sailed from San Francisco August 23 for Honolulu with general; arrived September 1. Sailed from Honolulu September 10 for San Francisco with sugar; arrived September 22. At San Francisco idle October 5. Sailed from San Francisco October 8 for Arica without; arrived November 1. Sailed from Iquique November 12, 1918.

Calata (Ballin type). Builders: Supple & Ballin, Portland, Ore. Delivered August 13, 1918. Sailed from Astoria August 17 for San Francisco in ballast; arrived August 19. Sailed from San Francisco August 30 for Honolulu with general; arrived September 8. Sailed from Honolulu September 21 for San Francisco with sugar; arrived October 1. At San Francisco idle October 5. Sailed from San Francisco October 17 for Honolulu with general; arrived at Balboa November 3. Sailed from Cristobal November 9 for New York with salmon; arrived Norfolk November 18. Sailed from Norfolk November 21 for New York with general.

Bellota (Ferris type). Builders: R. J. Chandler, Wilmington, Cal. Delivered August 13, 1918. Sailed from Los Angeles for San Francisco; arrived August 11. Sailed from San Francisco August 31 for Honolulu with general; arrived September 9. Sailed from Honolulu September 13 for San Francisco with pines and sugar; arrived September 26. At San Francisco repairing October 11. Sailed from San Francisco October 17

for Honolulu with coal; arrived at Honolulu October 28. Sailed from Honolulu October 31; arrived at Honolulu November 5. November 18 lost rudder 280 miles out of San Francisco; tug *Tatoosh* ordered to assist.

Blackford (Grays Harbor type). Builders: Grays Harbor M. S. Corporation, Grays Harbor, Wash. Delivered August 23, 1918. Sailed from San Francisco August 29 for Arica; put in at San Francisco for bunkers September 2. Sailed from San Francisco September 4 for Arica; arrived at San Pedro September 7, engine trouble. Sailed from San Pedro September 10 for Arica without; drifted ashore at Mazatlan September 25.

Mojave (Ferris type). Builders: Seaborn Shipyard, Tacoma, Wash. Delivered August 24, 1918. Sailed from Seattle August 27 for Arica without; arrived San Diego September 1. Sailed from San Diego September 3 for Arica; arrived at Callao September 23. Sailed from Callao September 28 for Arica. Sailed from Arica October 1 for loading port; arrived at Junin October 3. Sailed from Junin October 18 for Balboa; arrived at Callao October 22. Sailed from Salina Cruz November 8 for San Francisco; arrived San Diego November 16. Sailed from San Diego November 16 for San Pedro with general.

Yehama (Hough type). Builders: Fulton Steamship Co., Wilmington, Cal. Delivered August 26, 1918. Sailed from San Francisco September 1 for Honolulu. Sailed from San Francisco September 1 for New York; arrived at Mazatlan September 8. Sailed from San Francisco September 9 for New York; arrived at Balboa, Canal Zone, September 20; general. Sailed from Cristobal September 22 for New York with general; arrived at New York October 1. Drydock at Pier 36, Barber Line, Brooklyn; at New York October 11, repairing. Sailed from New York October 19 for Norfolk with general; arrived October 22. Sailed from Norfolk October 30 for Cuba. November 15 fire broke out in forward hold at Habana and did considerable damage. Will return to States for permanent repairs.

Coos Bay (Hough type). Builders: Coos Bay Shipbuilding Co., Coos Bay, Ore. Delivered August 27, 1918. At San Francisco repairing August 30. Sailed from San Francisco September 3 for Arica without. United States Navy ship *Navshan* reports that she disappeared from view at 2 a. m. September 16 at 22° 1' latitude north and 110° 10' west.

Dumaru (Hough type). Builders: Grant, Smith & Porter, St. Johns, Ore. Delivered August 28, 1918. Sailed from Astoria September 2 for San Francisco in ballast; arrived September 4. Sailed from San Francisco September 12 for Seattle with general; arrived at Seattle, Honolulu, September 23. Sailed from Honolulu September 25 for Manila. October 16 destroyed by an explosion of oil cargo by lightning near Guam.

Red Cloud (McClelland type). Builders: Merrill Stevens Co., Jacksonville, Fla. Delivered August 28, 1918. Sailed from Jacksonville September 15 for Port Arthur with light; arrived September 24. Sailed from Port Arthur October 4 for South Norwalk with lumber; arrived at New York October 21. Sailed from New York October 21 for South Norwalk with general; arrived at New York October 30.

Nemacki (Ferris type). Builders: Tampa Dock Co., Tampa, Fla. Delivered August 31, 1918. Sailed from Jacksonville September 10 for Norfolk with light; arrived September 14. Sailed from Norfolk September 17 for New York with light; arrived September 18. October 5 operators say will not be ready before 19th or 20th of October; now expected to be ready the 28th or 29th. November 15, 1918, returning to New York with general. Sailed from New York November 15, 1918, for Newport News with ballast; arrived November 17. Sailed from Norfolk November 20, 1918, for Bermuda with coal.

Dancy (Ferris type). J. W. Muddock, builder, Jacksonville, Fla. Delivered August 31, 1918. Sailed from Jacksonville September 21, 1918, for Norfolk; arrived September 25, 1918; light. Sailed from Norfolk September 29, 1918, for Baltimore; arrived September 30, 1918; ballast. Sailed from Baltimore October 19, 1918, for Boston; arrived at New York October 22, 1918; coal. Sailed from New York October 28, 1918, for Boston; arrived November 2, 1918; coal.

Appalachee (McClelland type). Merrill Stevens Co., builders, Jacksonville, Fla. Delivered August 31, 1918. Sailed from Jacksonville October 1, 1918, for Savannah; arrived October 4, 1918; light. Sailed from Savannah October 7, 1918, for Norfolk; arrived October 9, 1918; ballast. Sailed from Norfolk October 12, 1918, for Boston; arrived October 17, 1918; coal. Sailed from Boston October 21, 1918, for Norfolk; arrived October 24, 1918, ballast. Sailed from Norfolk October 29, 1918, for Portland; arrived November 2, 1918; coal. Sailed from Portland November 8, 1918, for Baltimore; arrived November 11, 1918; light. Sailed from Baltimore November 15, 1918, for Boston; arrived November 19, 1918; coal.

Andra (Ferris type). Portland Ship Ceiling Co., builders, Portland, Me. Delivered August 31, 1918. Sailed from Portland September 1, 1918, for Boston; arrived September 2, 1918; light. Sailed from Boston September 5, 1918, for Norfolk; arrived September 16, 1918; ballast. Sailed from Norfolk September 20, 1918, for New Bedford; arrived September 23, 1918; coal. Sailed from New Bedford September 25, 1918, for New York; arrived September 26, 1918; Morse's dry dock.

Hokah (Ferris type). Grotton Iron Works, builders, Noank, Conn. Delivered August 31, 1918. Sailed from Providence August 27, 1918, for New York; arrived August 28, 1918; light. Sailed from New York September 23, 1918, for Baltimore; arrived September 25, 1918; ballast. Sailed from Baltimore September 27, 1918, for Seaport; arrived October 1, 1918; coal. Sailed from Bangor, Me., October 1, 1918, for Rockland, Me.; arrived October 2, 1918; light. Sailed from Rockland October 8, 1918, for Norfolk; arrived October 10, 1918; light. Sailed from Norfolk October 13, 1918, for Boston; arrived October 16, 1918; coal. Sailed from Boston October 21, 1918, for Baltimore; arrived October 22, 1918; light. Sailed from Baltimore October 24, 1918, for Boston; arrived October 28, 1918; coal. Sailed from Boston October 30, 1918, for Norfolk; arrived November 3, 1918; light. Sailed from Norfolk November 6, 1918, for Providence; arrived November 8, 1918; coal. Sailed from Providence November 19, 1918, for Baltimore; arrived November 21, 1918; ballast.

Alvada (Ferris type). Taylor Shipbuilding Co., builder, Cornwall Heights, Pa. Delivered August 31, 1918. Sailed from Philadelphia September 1, 1918, for New York; arrived September 2, 1918; general. Sailed from New York October 23, 1918, for Norfolk; arrived October 24, 1918; general. Sailed from Norfolk November 5, 1918, for Cuba; arrived November 18, 1918; coal.

Accoma (Ferris type). Foundation Co., builders, Newark, N. J. Delivered August 31, 1918. Sailed from New York September 28, 1918, for Baltimore; arrived September 30, 1918; general. Sailed from Baltimore October 2, 1918, for Providence; arrived October 5, 1918; coal. Sailed from Boston October 9, 1918, for Baltimore; arrived

October 12, 1918; light. Sailed from Baltimore October 15, 1918, for Boston; arrived October 21, 1918; coal. Sailed from Boston October 24, 1918, for Baltimore; arrived October 28, 1918; light. Sailed from Baltimore October 30, 1918, for Portland; arrived November 3, 1918; coal. Sailed from Portland November 7, 1918, for Baltimore; arrived November 11, 1918; light. Sailed from Baltimore November 14, 1918, for Boston; arrived November 18, 1918; coal.

Menada (Ferris type). Grant Smith Porter, builder, Aberdeen, Wash. Delivered August 31, 1918. Sailed from Astoria September 1, 1918, for Arica; put into San Francisco; engine trouble. Sailed from San Francisco October 19, 1918, for Honolulu; arrived October 30, 1918; coal.

Abrigada (Grays Harbor type). Builders: Grays Harbor Motor Ship Co., Grays Harbor, Wash. Delivered August 31, 1918. Sailed from Tacoma September 24 for Arica; arrived San Francisco September 28, leaking.

Baladan (Hough type). Builders: Kruse & Banks, North Bend, Ore. Delivered September 1, 1918. Sailed San Francisco September 14 for Arica in ballast; arrived October 10. Sailed Mejellones October 24 for San Francisco with nitrate.

Dalana (Ballin type). Builders: Supple & Ballin, Portland, Ore. Delivered September 3, 1918. Sailed Portland September 7 for Arica in ballast; put into San Diego September 14, leaking. Sailed San Diego October 11 for Chile. Sailed Junin, Chile, November 11 for Atlantic port with nitrate.

Wakan (Hough type). Builders: Grant Smith Porter Ship Co., St. Johns, Ore. Delivered September 4, 1918. Sailed Portland September 9 for Seattle in ballast; arrived September 11. Sailed Seattle September 23 for Hongkong with general cargo. Put into San Francisco in distress September 30. Sailed San Francisco November 7 for Hongkong.

Bonafon (Ferris type). Builders: Nilson & Kelez, Seattle, Wash. Delivered September 9, 1918. Sailed Port Gamble September 19 for Honolulu with lumber; arrived October 6. Sailed Honolulu October 14 for San Francisco with general cargo; arrived October 25.

Boulton (Ferris type). Builders: Meacham & Babcock, Seattle, Wash. Delivered September 12, 1918. Sailed Seattle September 25 for Norfolk with general cargo; arrived October 27. Sailed Norfolk November 9 for New York with cotton; arrived November 10. Sailed New York November 15 for Charleston with general cargo; arrived November 19.

Barabos (Ferris type). Builders: The Coast Shipbuilding Co., Portland, Ore. Delivered September 12, 1918. Sailed from Portland September 16 for Arica, in ballast. Put into San Francisco September 20 with engine trouble. Sailed from San Francisco September 27 for Arica. Put into San Pedro October 7 with engine trouble. Sailed from San Pedro October 13 for Arica.

Capanka (Hough type). Builders: Grant Smith Porter Ship Co., St. Johns, Ore. Delivered September 13, 1918. Sailed from Astoria September 19 for San Francisco, in ballast. Arrived September 22. Sailed from San Francisco October 1 for Manila, with general. Arrived November 11.

Cheron (Ferris type). Builders: Seaborn Shipyards, Tacoma, Wash. Delivered September 13, 1918. Sailed from Tacoma September 19 for New York, general. Arrived at Baltimore October 25. Sailed from Baltimore November 4 for Savannah, with general. Arrived November 10. Sailed from Savannah November 14 for Boston, with general. Arrived November 18.

Keota (Ferris type). Builders: Hammond Lumber Co., Humboldt Bay, Cal. Delivered September 12, 1918. Sailed from San Francisco September 14 for Arica, with general. Arrived October 11. Sailed from Arica October 16 for Norfolk, with nitrates. Arrived November 8. Sailed from Norfolk November 15 for New York, in ballast. Arrived November 16.

Beloit (Ferris type). Builders: Tacoma Shipbuilding Co., Tacoma, Wash. Delivered September 16, 1918. Sailed from Victoria for Honolulu September 22, with coal. Arrived October 3. Sailed from Honolulu October 11 for San Francisco, with sugar. Arrived October 20.

Bowley (Ferris type). Builders: Grant Smith Porter Ship Co., Aberdeen, Wash. Delivered September 19, 1918. Sailed from Portland September 30 for New York, with flour. Arrived November 17.

Bagan (Ferris type). Builders: Russell Shipbuilding Co., East Deering, Me. Delivered September 19, 1918. Sailed from Portland, Me., September 20 for Baltimore, in ballast. Arrived September 24. Sailed from Baltimore October 7 for Boston, with coal. Arrived October 12. Sailed from Boston November 5 for Baltimore, in ballast. Arrived November 7. Sailed from Baltimore November 8 for Providence, with coal. Arrived November 11.

Bromela (Grays Harbor type). Builders: The Grays Harbor Motor Ship Co., Grays Harbor, Wash. Delivered September 21, 1918. Sailed from Grays Harbor September 22 for Comox, British Columbia, in ballast. Sailed from Comox September 30 for Honolulu. Put into Victoria with engine trouble October 1. Sailed from Victoria October 5 for Honolulu. Put back again to Victoria with engine trouble October 8, leaking; arrived Seattle October 13 for repairs.

Quoque (Ferris type). Builders: Wilson Shipbuilding Co., Portland, Ore. Delivered September 21, 1918. Sailed from Astoria September 27 for Arica in ballast. Put into Acapulco. Sailed from Acapulco October 29 for Arica. Put into Balboa November 16.

Kuwa (Hough type). Builders: Grant-Smith-Porter Ship Co., De-Johns, Ore. Delivered September 21, 1918. Sailed from Astoria September 27 for Arica in ballast. Put into San Pedro October 1 with engine trouble. Sailed from San Pedro October 7 for Pisagua, Chile; arrived November 4. Sailed from Pisagua November 15 for Atlantic port with nitrate.

Coweta (Ferris type). Builders: Foundation Co., Newark, N. J. Delivered September 21, 1918. Sailed from New York October 19 for Norfolk in ballast; arrived October 21. Sailed from Norfolk October 25 for Habana with coal; arrived October 31. Sailed from Habana November 3 for Sabine in ballast; arrived November 12. Sailed from Sabine November 13 for Baltimore with sulphur.

Alapaha (Ferris type). Builders: Traylor Shipbuilding Co., Cornwells, Pa. Delivered September 24, 1918. Sailed from Philadelphia September 25 for Baltimore in ballast; arrived September 27. Sailed from Baltimore September 29 for Boston with coal; arrived October 3. Sailed from Boston October 11 for Baltimore in ballast; arrived October 16. Sailed from Baltimore October 27 for Boston with coal; arrived November 2. Sailed from Boston November 6 for Baltimore in ballast; arrived November 9. Sailed from Baltimore November 13 for Providence with coal; arrived November 16.

Mazama (Ferris type). Builders: Seaborn Shipyards, Tacoma, Wash. Delivered September 24, 1918. Sailed from Seattle September 27 for San Francisco in ballast; arrived October 2. Sailed from San Fran-

cisco October 11 for Honolulu with general; arrived October 20. Sailed from Honolulu October 30 for San Francisco with pineapples; arrived November 10.

Cocconino (Hough type). Builders: Kruse & Banks, North Bend, Oreg. Delivered September 25, 1918. Sailed from San Francisco October 2 for Honolulu, with general. Put back to San Francisco October 7 leaking badly.

Botsford (McClellan type). Builders: Merrill-Stevens Shipbuilding Co., Jacksonville, Fla. Delivered September 30, 1918. Not yet ready for service.

Bailey (Ferris type). Builders: Hillyer-Speering-Dunn Co., Jacksonville, Fla. Delivered September 30, 1918. Sailed from Jacksonville September 30 for Norfolk in ballast; arrived October 7. Sailed from Norfolk for Halifax in naval service and further movements not given out.

Balliett (Hough type). Builders: Coos Bay Shipbuilding Co., Marshfield, Oreg. Delivered September 30, 1918. Sailed from San Francisco October 5 for Honolulu, with general; arrived October 17. Sailed from Honolulu October 29 for San Francisco, with pineapples; arrived November 12.

Bancraft (Ferris type). Builders: Grant Smith Porter Ship Co., Aberdeen, Wash. Delivered September 30, 1918. Sailed from Astoria October 7 for Comox, British Columbia, in ballast. Sailed from Comox October 16 for Honolulu, with coal; arrived November 2. Sailed from Honolulu November 20 for San Francisco.

Holbrook (Hough type). Builders: Grant Smith Porter Ship Co., St. Johns, Oreg. Delivered September 30, 1918. Sailed from Portland October 7 for San Francisco, in ballast; arrived October 9. Sailed from San Francisco October 20 for Honolulu, with general; arrived October 30. Sailed from Honolulu November 15 for Seattle, with general.

Pascagoula (Ferris type). Builders: Dierks-Blodgett Shipbuilding Co., Pascagoula, Miss. Delivered October 1, 1918. Turned over to United States Navy and further movements not given out.

Banago (Ferris type). Builders: Alabama Dry Dock & Shipbuilding Co., Mobile, Ala. Delivered October 1, 1918. Turned over to United States Navy and further movements not given out.

Bedminster (Ferris type). Morey & Thomas, builders, Jacksonville, Fla. Delivered September 26, 1918. Sailed from Jacksonville October 18, 1918, for Philadelphia; arrived at Charleston October 21, 1918. Sailed from Charleston November 8, 1918 for Philadelphia. Returned to Charleston short of bunkers, oil, water, and with engine trouble. Sailed from Charleston November 20, 1918, for Philadelphia.

Wallacea (Ballin type). Supple & Ballin, builders, Portland, Oreg. Delivered September 28, 1918. Sailed from Portland October 2, 1918, for Arica. Put into San Francisco October 7, 1918, on account of leaking condenser. Sailed from San Francisco October 18, 1918, for South America. Arrived at Caleta Buena November 10, 1918. Sailed from Arica November 17, 1918.

Auria (Ferris type). Tampa Dock Co., builders, Tampa, Fla. Delivered September 30, 1918. Sailed from Tampa October 9, 1918, for Jacksonville; arrived October 13, 1918, for dry docking. Expected to be ready November 30, 1918.

Congaree (Ferris type). Foundation Co., Newark N. J. Delivered October 1, 1918. Sailed from New York September 28, 1918; trial trip. Arrived at New York October 10, 1918.

Catawba (Hough type). Fulton Shipbuilding Co., builders, Wilmington, Cal. Delivered October 4, 1918. Sailed from San Francisco October 15, 1918, for New York; returned to San Francisco November 4, 1918, for repairs (general cargo).

Aberdeen (Grays Harbor type). Grays Harbor M. S. Corporation, builders, Grays Harbor, Wash. Delivered October 6, 1918. Not yet ready for service.

Astoria (Hough type). McEachern Ship Co., builders, Astoria, Oreg. Delivered October 10, 1918. Sailed from Astoria October 24, 1918, for San Francisco; arrived October 27, 1918. Sailed from San Francisco November 4, 1918, for Honolulu.

Nashotah (Ferris type). Grant-Smith-Porter Co., builders, St. Johns, Oreg. Delivered October 14, 1918. Sailed from Union Bay October 24, 1918, for Honolulu; arrived November 8, 1918.

Lone Star (Ferris type). Lone Star Shipbuilding Co., builders, Beaumont, Tex. Delivered October 14, 1918. Sailed from Port Arthur October 12, 1918, for Galveston; arrived October 14, 1918. Sailed from Galveston October 24, 1918, for Port Arthur; arrived October 25, 1918. Sailed from Port Arthur October 26, 1918, for New York; put into Galveston, leaking, October 27, 1918. Sailed from Galveston November 21, 1918, for New York.

Kinco (Ferris type). G. M. Standifer, builder, Portland, Oreg. Delivered October 16, 1918. Sailed from Astoria October 21, 1918, for San Francisco; arrived October 23, 1918. Sailed from San Francisco November 4, 1918, for Honolulu. Being towed back to San Francisco because of boiler trouble; arrived November 12, 1918, in tow of the *Balliett*.

Chimo (Ferris type). Seaborn Shipyards, builders, Tacoma, Wash. Delivered October 18, 1918. Sailed from Puget Sound October 26, 1918, for Honolulu; arrived at Honolulu November 13, 1918. Cargo, coal.

Anoka (builders' design). Builders: Peninsular Shipbuilding Co., Portland, Oreg. Delivered October 26, 1918. Sailed from Portland, Oreg., for San Francisco October 30; arrived November 2, 1918; ballast.

Buhisan (Ferris type). Builders: Traylor Shipbuilding Co., Cornwall, Pa. Delivered October 29, 1918. Sailed from Philadelphia for Brunswick November 2, 1918; arrived November 5, 1918. Sailed from Brunswick for New York; arrived November 12, 1918; general.

Balsto (Ferris type). Builders: Groton Iron Works, Noank, Conn. Delivered October 29, 1918. Sailed from Providence for Norfolk November 12, 1918; arrived November 14, 1918; ballast.

Alanthus (Ferris type). Builders: Foundation Co., Newark, N. J. Delivered October 29, 1918. Made sea trial November 1, 1918. At Crane's dry dock, Brooklyn; recaulking November 15, 1918.

Lonoke (Ferris type). Builders: Wilson Shipbuilding Co., Astoria, Oreg. Delivered October 30, 1918. Sailed from Astoria, Oreg., for San Francisco November 5, 1918; arrived November 7, 1918; ballast.

Bonham (Hough type). Builders: National Shipbuilding Co., Orange, Tex. Delivered October 28, 1918. Sailed from Port Arthur for Philadelphia November 6, 1918; arrived at New Orleans November 8, 1918, with water in forward and aft hold. Sailed from New Orleans for Philadelphia November 17, 1918; sulphur.

Nupoleia (Ferris type). Builders: Grant-Smith-Porter, St. Johns, Oreg. Delivered October 31, 1918. Sailed from Portland, Oreg., for San Francisco November 2, 1918; arrived November 9, 1918; ballast.

Bayou Teche (Ferris type). Builders: Jahncke Shipbuilding Co., Madisonville, La. Delivered October 31, 1918. Delivered by builders but not yet ready for service.

Belair (Ferris type). Builders: Dierks-Blodgett, Pascagoula, Miss. Delivered October 31, 1918. Sailed from Pascagoula for New Orleans on trial trip; arrived October 27, 1918. Sailed from New Orleans for Galveston; arrived November 10, 1918. Sailed from Galveston for Port Arthur November 17, 1918; arrived November 17, 1918; sulphur. Sailed from Port Arthur for New York November 18, 1918; sulphur; November 19, 1918, lost rudder post 90 miles southeast of South Pass. Two vessels from New Orleans ordered to assist.

Forster (Ferris type). Nilson & Kelez Shipbuilding Corporation, builders, Seattle, Wash. Delivered October 18, 1918. Sailed from Puget Sound October 26, 1918, for Honolulu; arrived at Honolulu November 13, 1918.

Daca (Ferris type). Meacham & Babcock, builders, Seattle, Wash. Delivered October 19, 1918. Sailed from Puget Sound October 26, 1918, for San Francisco. At Seattle November 4, 1918, repairing. Will discharge cargo into Norwegian ship *Tancred*.

Airline (Ballin type). Supple & Ballin, builders, Portland, Oreg. Delivered October 22, 1918. Sailed from Astoria October 28, 1918, for San Francisco; arrived October 29, 1918. Sailed from San Francisco November 6, 1918, for Honolulu; arrived November 17, 1918.

Okeas (Ferris type). Russell Shipbuilding Co., builders, Portland, Me. Delivered October 23, 1918. Sailed from Portland October 25, 1918, for New York; arrived October 26, 1918. Sailed from New York November 3, 1918, for Fall River; arrived November 4, 1918.

Barrington (Ferris type). Coast Shipbuilding Co., builders, Portland, Oreg. Delivered October 23, 1918. Sailed from Portland October 26, 1918, for San Francisco. At Astoria; sailed from Astoria October 29, 1918, for San Francisco; arrived October 31, 1918. Sailed from San Francisco November 11, 1918, for Honolulu (general cargo).

Chibiabos (Ferris type). L. H. Shattuc (Inc.), Portsmouth, N. H. Delivered October 31, 1918. Arrived at Boston November 13, 1918 (light cargo).

Alabat (Ferris type). American Shipbuilding Co., Brunswick, Ga. Delivered October 31, 1918. Sailed from Jacksonville November 19, 1918, for Philadelphia.

Harish (Ferris type). J. M. Murdock, builder, Jacksonville, Fla. Delivered October 31, 1918.

Wihaha (Ferris type). Grant Smith Port, builder, Aberdeen, Wash. Delivered November 1, 1918. Sailed from Portland November 9, 1918, for San Francisco; disabled off Point Arena, being towed to San Francisco; arrived November 16, 1918.

Salmon (Hough type). McEachern Shipyards, builder, Astoria, Oreg. Delivered November 1, 1918. Sailed from Astoria November 8, 1918, for San Francisco; arrived November 14, 1918 (ballast).

Bloomington (Ferris type). Hammond Lumber Co., builder, Humboldt Bay, Cal. Delivered November 5, 1918. Sailed from San Francisco November 13, 1918, for Honolulu.

Ballino (McClellan type). Mobile Shipbuilding Co., builders, Mobile, Ala. Delivered October 31, 1918. Sailed from Mobile on trial trip October 23, 1918. Sailed from Mobile for Galveston November 8, 1918; arrived Galveston November 11, 1918; ballast.

Alpaco (Ferris type). Hodge Shipbuilding Co., Moss Point, Miss. Delivered October 31, 1918. Delivered, but not yet ready for service.

Oneco (Ferris type). Beaumont Shipbuilding Co., Beaumont, Tex. Delivered October 31, 1918. Sailed from Beaumont September 15, 1918, for New Orleans; arrived September 19, 1918; ballast. In dry dock.

Necotah (Ferris type). Grant-Smith-Porter Shipbuilding Co., St. Johns, Oreg. Delivered October 23, 1918. Sailed from Portland October 29, 1918, for San Francisco; arrived November 1, 1918. Sailed from San Francisco November 21, 1918, for Hilo, Hawaii.

Wakanna (Ferris type). Seaborn Shipyards, builder, Tacoma, Wash. Delivered October 31, 1918. Not yet ready for service.

Tillamook (Ferris type). Grant-Smith-Porter Shipbuilding Co., St. Johns, Oreg. Delivered November 6, 1918. Sailed from Astoria November 11, 1918, for San Francisco; arrived November 14, 1918.

Blythedale (Ferris type). R. J. Chandler, builder, Wilmington, Cal. Delivered November 11, 1918. Not yet ready for service.

Bagoso (Ferris type). Morey & Thomas, builder, Jacksonville, Fla. Delivered November 12, 1918. Not yet ready for service.

Mahaska (Ferris type). Barber Bros., builders, Tacoma, Wash. Delivered August 31, 1918. Sailed from Tacoma September 7, 1918, for Honolulu; arrived September 20, 1918. Sailed from Honolulu October 14, 1918, for San Francisco; arrived October 26, 1918.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I am obliged to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] for permitting this interruption at this time. As I have said, I am not contending that the Shipping Board should make any additional contracts for the construction of this type of ship if they are now in a position to contract for a different and superior type and have the time to build other types of ships which more nearly suit their needs; but at the same time I want to make this showing of facts as to the performance of the wooden ships and to insist that they have not been failures by any means; that they are valuable cargo carriers and that these yards can be utilized not only in the building of such types of ships as they have been building but can be used in the construction of smaller vessels, in the construction of tugs, and in the construction of pontoons and of other shipping craft.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President—
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator from Washington.
Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I simply want to say, in confirmation of what the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] has stated, that when I was out in Seattle a short time ago I talked with some of the leading shipping men there and asked them particularly what the record of these wooden ships had been as to efficiency and good service. Some of them were men who were inclined, I knew, toward steel construction, but they said these ships had rendered splendid service; that they were good cargo-carrying ships, especially for the coastwise trade, and even upon voyages of considerable length; that the

current rumors that had been given out, in their judgment, were practically without foundation.

I simply want to add that statement to the facts which the Senator from Florida has given and to say that I am in general accord with his suggestions.

I do not want the Shipping Board to enter into new contracts for the construction of additional wooden ships, especially if we can get plenty of steel ships; but there are some contracts which have been made and which have been in large part performed for such ships; and it would entail upon the Government a very great loss if such construction were suspended. Those ships I should like to see the Shipping Board complete. I think, when constructed, the ships would render good service, and that they could be disposed of, if we ever found it necessary to dispose of them, in a very advantageous way.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I am glad to have the confirmation of my position by the Senator from Washington; and I will simply add that, in my judgment, it would be a great mistake to cancel our contracts for such ships where material has been ordered and is on the ground and the builders are prepared to go on with the construction of the ships, for, whether the Shipping Board really needs those ships or not, they can undoubtedly be disposed of, so that there will be no loss in their construction, and it might be a reasonable business proposition. At any rate, the evidence is clear that it is not a waste of money to construct such ships. There is a demand for them if the Shipping Board shall not want them; and, whether they want them or not and will need them in the operations that they have in mind, there will be others who will want them.

Mr. HARDING and Mr. LENROOT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield first to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, I want to ask the chairman of the Committee on Commerce [Mr. FLETCHER] if I understood him to say that these ships could be disposed of without loss?

Mr. FLETCHER. I said I thought they could be disposed of without loss.

Mr. HARDING. Well, is the Senator from Florida not aware of the fact that the Shipping Board is already talking of a plan of writing off the cost of these ships in order to operate them successfully?

Mr. FLETCHER. I have seen some suggestions of that kind, but I do not think they come from the Shipping Board. I think that is an idea which has been advanced by others.

Mr. HARDING. Mr. President, I am prepared to say that it does come from the Shipping Board, and I take issue with the Senator from Florida on the wisdom of going on with the contracts for the construction of such ships which have not already been begun and building at Government expense under the extraordinary conditions which were developed to meet a war emergency. With the permission of the Senate, I shall be glad to make some remarks upon that subject at a time when I shall not be intruding upon the Senator who has the floor.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will now recognize the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin desire to take the floor?

Mr. LENROOT. No; the Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] covered the question I had in mind.

THE COAL SITUATION.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON. If the Senator from North Carolina will yield to me a moment, I desire to report back favorably with an amendment, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, the resolution (S. Res. 374) providing for hearings before the Committee on Manufactures, and I call the attention of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] to the resolution.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] will kindly indulge me for just a moment, I should like to ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration and passage of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Kansas, chairman of the Committee on Contingent Expenses. It will not take a moment to pass the resolution. It merely authorizes the Committee on Manufactures to pursue further its investigation of the coal situation and to visit the anthracite coal fields of Pennsylvania and pay the expenses therefor. The committee thinks it prudent to undertake

this matter. I should like to have the resolution passed, because I desire to go into this question in all of its phases and to correct what upon the surface appears to be a great economic abuse.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi whether this committee is the one that had under investigation the Hog Island frauds and scandals?

Mr. VARDAMAN. No; that was the Commerce Committee.

Mr. KING. I knew that the Senator from Mississippi was a member of the committee which had been investigating that question.

Mr. VARDAMAN. There was no subcommittee appointed for the purpose of investigating the Hog Island scandal. The pending resolution refers to a subcommittee appointed by the Committee on Manufactures. That committee desires to visit the anthracite coal fields of Pennsylvania and other coal fields in order to make further investigation; that is all.

Mr. KING. While the Senator is on the floor I should like to ask what has become of the investigation of Hog Island, first, by the committee, and, secondly, as I understand, by the Department of Justice? There was a great deal of vulgar robbery, stealing, and thievery by men engaged in the Hog Island enterprise, and I think the committee ought to make a report.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I think the language employed by the Senator from Utah, when we consider the provocation, is very moderate in his characterization of the conduct of certain plutocratic individuals connected with the Hog Island enterprise. And I agree with him that the report ought to be made, and I trust it will be, some of these days. The result of the investigation made by the Department of Justice, I understand, is in the hands of Mr. Hurley. It was first sent to the President, who, in turn, sent it to Mr. Hurley, and Mr. Hurley is now in Europe, I am advised. I join with the Senator from Utah in the desire to see the report of the Department of Justice. I wish also that the American people could see the Hog Island infamy, as it appears to me, in all of its naked enormity. In the name of patriotism the American people have been robbed by this corporation most shamefully. It would not have been tolerated a moment if it had been attempted at any other time than in time of war.

Mr. KING. Why did not the Committee on Commerce, which started the investigation, complete the investigation and make a report?

Mr. VARDAMAN. I do not think the investigation has been completed. I am sure it has not, as thoroughly as it ought to be, but, of course, I will not presume to speak for the entire committee—I am only one member of that committee—as to why the report has not been made. The hearings, however, have been published, and the Senator can judge for himself.

Mr. KING. I read a portion of the testimony, and it showed such fraud, so much stealing and wrongdoing, that I think the committee ought to complete its report and submit its findings to the Senate.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I think the Senator is right about that.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, may I state to the Senator, with reference to that investigation—

Mr. VARDAMAN. Let me suggest to the Senator that he permit the pending resolution to be disposed of, and then the Senator from Florida can discuss the question.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am not going to discuss it; I wish simply to answer the inquiries. The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] wanted to know why the committee had not done certain things. The report as to Hog Island, to which the Senator from Mississippi has referred, has been requested by the Committee on Commerce, at least a copy of it, by a resolution adopted at its last meeting. We shall have an answer to that as soon as we meet again, and that answer will be, I take it, somewhat in line with what the Senator from Mississippi has suggested. At the same time, I do not want the inference to go out that the committee is neglecting its duty in the matter.

Whether that report is of a confidential nature or is in the nature of an official document, submitted by the Department of Justice to the President on his request, and we are entitled to it or not, is a matter that we can determine when we get to it; but that investigation was based upon the idea that there were certain matters in connection with the Hog Island transaction and the construction of the shipyard there that needed to be inquired into by the Department of Justice; in other words, to ascertain whether there were any violations of law in connection with it. That phase of the matter was turned over to the Department of Justice, and the Committee on Commerce has not gone into it since it was taken up by the Department of Justice.

Their report will probably cover that inquiry; but it is a report, as I have said, that was called for by the President, and, of course, it is a report that is in his hands or in the hands of those to whom he may have sent it. However, we will find out about it.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, there is enough testimony already in the hands of the Committee on Commerce to justify a report to Congress looking to the abrogation of the contract entered into by the corporation for the construction of the Hog Island Shipyard. I think this enterprise is the most shameful scheme to rob the Public Treasury that has been entered into since 1914. Certain very wealthy men are to be paid a percentage on the construction of the ships to be built by this plant, erected at the cost of the Government, for which the aforesaid plutocrats did not contribute a dollar in money or a penny's worth of work. It is my judgment that it is one of the most disgraceful incidents in the annals of American history. Such a fraud should not be tolerated. But I am not going to discuss that now. I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolution which has just been reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Mississippi for the immediate consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate, by unanimous consent, proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, with an amendment, on page 1, line 15, after the word "printed," to strike out the words "and to employ such other clerical assistance as may be necessary," so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Manufactures of the Senate be, and it hereby is, authorized and instructed to make inquiry into the coal situation, its production, transportation, and consumption.

Resolved further, That the said committee, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby empowered to sit and act during the session or recess of Congress, or of either House thereof, at such time and place as it may deem necessary; to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of witnesses and the production of papers, books, and documents; to employ stenographers, at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page, to take and make a record of all evidence taken and received by the committee and keep a record of its proceedings; to have such evidence, record, and other matter required by the committee printed. The chairman of the committee or any member thereof may administer oaths to witnesses. Subpoenas for witnesses shall be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or subcommittee thereof.

Resolved further, That the expenses thereof shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate on vouchers ordered by said committee, signed by the chairman thereof, and approved by the Committee on Contingent Expenses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

THE REVENUE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12863) to provide revenue, and for other purposes.

Mr. SMOOT submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27), which was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed 25,000 additional copies of Senate Document No. 310, Sixty-fifth Congress, entitled "Revenue bill of 1918," and that there be printed separately 10,000 additional copies each of the majority and minority reports and individual views of members of the Committee on Finance on H. R. 12863, the revenue bill of 1918, for the use of the Senate.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I think it is due to the Senate that I should follow the custom which I have uniformly followed heretofore, of making to the Senate a statement with respect to the changes and amendments that have been made in the House bill by the Committee on Finance. I shall make that statement as brief as possible.

I think, Mr. President, that every Senator, like myself, realizes the importance of prompt action in the consideration and passage of the pending bill. The taxes for the fiscal year 1919 can not be collected under it unless the time between its passage and the filing of the returns of the taxpayer is sufficient for administrative purposes. From two and one-half to three months will be absolutely necessary to enable the department to formulate regulations, print the millions upon millions of forms required, distribute them so as to reach the taxpayers of the country, and organize and train the great force necessary to personally instruct the taxpayers in properly preparing their returns.

The bill provides that the returns of the taxpayer shall be filed by the 15th day of March, and that the first installment of the taxes shall then be paid. This bill, as well as the present law, authorizes the commissioner to extend the time for making returns. If this extension is not made it will be necessary for the bill to pass by the 1st of January. If it is extended one

month, as was done in the case of the last returns under the present law, it will be sufficient if the bill becomes a law by the 1st of February. Such an extension will automatically extend the time for the payment of the first installment, which would result in more or less embarrassment to the Treasury. An extension of more than a month, it is felt by the department, would be impracticable. I should add that the date named, February 1, fixes the ultimate limit. Utilizing every resource and straining every nerve the Treasury Department can, if the bill passes by that date, administer the law. The law can not be successfully administered if passed after February 1.

I think all Senators will agree that in order to pass this bill by the 1st of February it will be necessary to extend—if not now, later—the hours of our sittings and to devote ourselves to the consideration of this measure to the exclusion, as far as practicable, of other measures, and, in addition, to confine the debate, as far as possible, to discussion of questions pertinent to the bill.

If the delay in the passage of the bill makes it necessary to collect the taxes for the fiscal year 1919 under the existing law, we can not expect to collect more than \$4,370,117,000, more than a billion and a half less than the Secretary of the Treasury estimates will be required. This sum, or an approximate amount, could be raised under the present law if it were amended so as to impose a war-profits tax of 80 per cent, the rate provided in the pending bill. Unless this bill passes, or the suggested amendment to the present law is made, the great war incomes and profits piled up during the present calendar year will escape war taxation, and the individuals and corporations who have made these big net incomes and profits will not contribute their just share to the burdens of the war to which they are mainly attributable. It will be unfortunate, indeed, if, by reason of the failure to pass the pending bill or amend the present law, the recipients of these great profits are allowed to keep for their own use the huge sum—approximating \$2,000,000,000—which they have expected to pay and which they have collected largely out of the people on the assumption that they would have to pay an 80 per cent war-profits tax. The effect would be to increase to that extent the burdens of the great mass of taxpayers throughout the country.

Under these circumstances, Mr. President, I feel that I can with propriety appeal to Senators, and I do now appeal to Senators, to cooperate in securing the speedy enactment of adequate legislation to make this deplorable eventuality impossible.

Early in the year 1917, and shortly after we entered the war, the two Houses of Congress, upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury and the President, began the consideration of a revenue bill to raise \$4,000,000,000 to meet the increased expenses on account of the war. That amount was all that was thought necessary at that time to pay the expenses of drafting, mobilizing, equipping, and supplying the added military and naval forces then contemplated, together with the necessary war expenditures resulting from that increase in the Army and the Navy and the military program.

The military situation early in the present year made it necessary, from the standpoint of safety and success, that the original program be changed. It was decided that it was necessary to raise an army of 5,000,000 soldiers, 4,000,000 of whom were intended for overseas service. It was also decided to be necessary, as a result, to enlarge our aircraft, Shipping Board, and ordnance programs. It was estimated that to meet the increased expenditures incident to this change of program we would need \$8,000,000,000 of revenue instead of \$4,000,000,000 for the fiscal year 1919.

Upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Ways and Means Committee of the House accordingly on the 29th day of May of this year entered upon the consideration of a new revenue bill to raise this additional amount. After nearly three months of hearings, investigations, study, and discussions, on September 3, 1918, the pending bill, estimated to raise eight billion and something over one hundred million dollars, was reported to the House and, with some amendments, was, I think, unanimously passed through that body. The bill was immediately reported to the Senate and referred to the Finance Committee.

I can say, Mr. President, without any reservation, that I have never known a committee, during my 18 years' service in the Senate, to work more earnestly, conscientiously, and continuously in the consideration and preparation of any measure than the Finance Committee in its work of revising and amending this bill.

The committee, after giving mature consideration to the many very vital amendments that it was deemed proper to make in the interest of justice and equity and the fair distribution of burdens, had practically completed its labors and was about ready

to report the measure to the Senate for its further action, when the sudden and unexpected, not to say dramatic, collapse of our enemies, and the signing of the armistice—the terms of which amounted practically to unconditional surrender—radically changed the whole situation from the revenue standpoint. The task of providing revenue for financing the operations of the Government while engaged in a great war gave way to the task of financing the Government through the period of demobilization and reconstruction. Manifestly the two problems are not the same, and tax legislation appropriate to the one is not wholly appropriate to the other.

Not only we but our allies, as a matter of policy, had, during the war, sought by repressive taxation and other means to diminish the demand for labor, capital, and raw materials employed in the production of nonessential things. This policy was not only justifiable but necessary to conserve labor, capital, and raw materials for war purposes. But the same reasons, Mr. President, which justify and make proper and necessary these repressive taxes in times of war manifestly make them undesirable and even obnoxious in times of peace.

This interpretation of the financial significance of the cessation of the war was set forth in a letter addressed by the Secretary of the Treasury to me as chairman of the committee on the 14th day of November. In that letter the Secretary of the Treasury declared that—

the collapse of our enemies necessitates instant reconsideration of the financial plans of the Government.

He added:

The prompt enactment of a revenue bill is imperative. The existing law is not satisfactory to the country nor to the Treasury. On the other hand, the revenue bill which passed the House is more stringent than the changed situation will justify.

In this letter the Secretary of the Treasury expressed the belief that the actual expenditures of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, would be around \$18,000,000,000 instead of \$24,000,000,000, as originally estimated, and recommended that the pending bill be revised with a view to raising \$6,000,000,000 instead of \$8,000,000,000 during the calendar year 1919, and \$4,000,000,000 during the calendar year 1920. This recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury has been acted upon by the committee, and the necessary changes and amendments made to give it effect.

It is estimated that of the six billions it is expected the bill as amended will raise for the present fiscal year, \$4,707,000,000 will be realized from income, war excess profits, and inheritance or estate taxes, and the balance from miscellaneous taxes. Of the four billions which the bill is estimated to raise in the year 1920 about \$3,000,000,000 will be raised from income and excess-profits taxes and the balance from miscellaneous taxes.

There was very little division, Mr. President, in the committee with respect to the six-billion program for 1919, but with respect to the reduction of two billions proposed for the fiscal year 1920 there was sharp disagreement. It was contended that the time for making the reductions recommended by the Treasury had not arrived, and that the Congress could safely be trusted to make the reductions when the time did arrive.

It is contended by the minority that this is not the proper time to make the reductions recommended by the Secretary for the fiscal year 1919–20, based upon the profits and incomes for the calendar year 1919, but that these reductions should be postponed to a future session of the Congress.

These gentlemen admit it is entirely proper for the Congress which assembled on the 3d day of December, 1917, to provide for an increase in the revenues to meet increased expenditures for the fiscal year 1918–19, but they deny that it is proper for the Congress which assembled on the 2d of December, 1918, to enact legislation to reduce the revenues to be raised by taxation for the fiscal year 1919–20 based upon the profits and incomes of 1919. The only difference in the two cases was that Congress assembled one day earlier in the one case than in the other and the problem in one case was to increase the taxes and in the other to lower them.

They base their contention in part upon the ground that there is no necessity grounded on public policy and interest which requires that these reductions be made now instead of later, in part upon the ground that there is uncertainty as to the correctness of the estimates of the department as to the expenditures during the year 1919–20, and in part upon the ground that that action now would controvert the practice of Congress in such cases.

Mr. President, I do not agree with any of these contentions. I do not think any of them is grounded in either good logic or in the facts and circumstances of the case. I believe that every consideration of sound public policy requires that these reductions for the fiscal year 1920, based on the incomes of 1919,

should be made at this session of Congress and as early as possible, to the end that the taxpayer and the consumer may know whether these taxes, which will be reflected in the prices charged and paid, are to be imposed upon the basis of a tax levy of six billions or four billions.

I believe that so far from the present being the wrong time to make these reductions, it is the right time to make them, and I do not believe there is any established practice of the Congress which demands otherwise or that there is any such uncertainty as to the estimated expenditures for the year 1919–20 as requires or makes it necessary or proper to delay action in making these reductions.

First, Mr. President, let me address myself to the question of public policy. Is it or is it not in the interest of justice and of the people, the seller and the buyer, that the question of what rates of taxes are to be imposed upon the profits and the incomes of the calendar year 1919, upon which we are about to enter, should be determined and fixed at the very earliest practicable moment? The minority says it is not. I do not agree with them; the Commissioner of Internal Revenue does not agree with them; the Secretary of the Treasury does not agree with them; the President of the United States does not agree with them.

The President in his late message strongly urged immediate legislation to this end. The Secretary of the Treasury in his letter to me on November 14 urged immediate legislation to this end.

Mr. President, the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury upon these points of expediency, of policy, of justice, is so strong, so explicit, so full, and so clear that I think I ought to read some extracts relating to this matter from it. The Secretary says in this letter:

Nor can I overemphasize the importance of determining now the basis of taxation which will apply to the calendar year 1920 as well as to the calendar year 1919. Business and industry and individual initiative and enterprise are entitled to know in advance the basis of taxation upon which all the activities of the Nation must be conducted. Prosperity can not be maintained if business is kept in uncertainty as to taxation. It is always unfortunate to be compelled to enact a tax bill at the end of the calendar year, with retroactive effect, instead of in advance of the calendar year, which would permit contracts and business arrangements generally to be entered into with certainty as to the burdens of taxation to be borne. This is a gross injustice to business and to all forms of enterprise. It is costly to the people at large, as they are required to pay higher prices for their necessities, because producers, in order to be on the safe side, fix prices on the assumption that taxes may be higher than they subsequently turn out to be. Definiteness and certainty as to the basis of taxation should be given in the pending bill, not alone as to the calendar year 1918 but as to the calendar year 1919. This will enable business and enterprise to proceed with confidence and courage.

I am constrained to read also an extract from the President's message upon this subject. It is very brief:

If the war had continued it would have been necessary to raise at least \$8,000,000,000 by taxation payable in the year 1919; but the war has ended, and I agree with the Secretary of the Treasury that it will be safe to reduce the amount to six billions. An immediate rapid decline in the expenses of the Government is not to be looked for. Contracts made for war supplies will, indeed, be rapidly canceled and liquidated, but their immediate liquidation will make heavy drains on the Treasury for the months just ahead of us. The maintenance of our forces on the other side of the sea is still necessary. A considerable proportion of those forces must remain in Europe during the period of occupation, and those which are brought home will be transported and demobilized at heavy expense for months to come. The interest on our war debt must of course be paid and provision made for the retirement of the obligations of the Government which represent it. But these demands will of course fall much below what a continuation of military operations would have entailed and six billions should suffice to supply a sound foundation for the financial operations of the year.

I entirely concur—

Says the President—

with the Secretary of the Treasury in recommending that the two billions needed in addition to the four billions provided by existing law be obtained from the profits which have accrued and shall accrue from war contracts and distinctively war business, but that these taxes be confined to the war profits accruing in 1918 or in 1919 from business originating in war contracts. I urge your acceptance of his recommendation that provision be made now, not subsequently, that the taxes to be paid in 1920 should be reduced from six to four billions. Any arrangements less definite than these would add elements of doubt and confusion to the critical period of industrial readjustment through which the country must now immediately pass, and which no true friend of the Nation's essential business interests can afford to be responsible for creating or prolonging. Clearly determined conditions, clearly and simply charted, are indispensable to the economic revival and rapid industrial development which may confidently be expected if we act now and sweep all interrogation points away.

Mr. President, I agree that it is unfortunate that there should be delay in the passage of a revenue bill which imposes taxes upon the current earnings of the year in which the measure must be passed. It has been unfortunate that heretofore in the enactment of these revenue bills it has been impracticable to secure their enactment into law until late in the calendar year the income for which was to be taxed. So two of these measures have had a retroactive effect. But, Mr. President, in both

instances where these bills have been delayed, as the present bill has been delayed, the necessity for the increase in the rates of taxation has been disclosed by events which happened or by conditions which first came to be understood and appreciated toward the middle of the year. The conditions which make it proper and necessary to reduce taxes for the fiscal year 1920, however, are apparent now; and this is the first time in recent years in which the facts making the change in the revenue law necessary and proper have been disclosed before the beginning of the taxable year for which new rates had to be imposed.

It will be recalled that the revenue act of September 8, 1916, was not introduced until somewhere near the middle of the year. It was not discovered until the taxable year had advanced many months that that act was necessary in order to meet the increasing expenditures of the Government, affected by the troubles on the Mexican border and influenced by the reflex action of the war in Europe. But just as soon as it was determined that it was necessary on account of the enormous increase in our expenses to raise additional revenue measures were immediately taken by the department responsible for the conduct of the fiscal affairs of the Government and by the Congress to enact suitable legislation.

Again, Mr. President, when the calendar year 1917 began we had no reason to believe that the laws then on the statute books would be insufficient to yield that part of the revenue which it was desirable to raise by taxation, but on the 6th day of April of that year the Government of the United States, acting upon the initiative of the people of the country—not of Congress and not of the President—decided that the common welfare and safety of this country required and made it the imperative duty of this Government to declare war against the Imperial German Government. Immediately it was recognized by all that it would become necessary, if we were to play the part assigned to us, if we were to render that assistance to our allies which was deemed essential in order to make success possible—I will not say "assured," but possible—that we should at once raise a great army of 2,000,000 men, mobilize them, equip them, furnish them the equipment and supplies necessary to make their service possible, and then provide the transportation incident to getting them across the water.

In order to do this it became necessary for us to adopt a new policy in this country—to enter upon a great scheme of war preparation; to build aircraft; to manufacture great quantities of ordnance; to speed up and enormously to expand our shipping program; and to provide for the manufacture of billions of dollars worth of materials that were required to minister to the needs of this great Army which we were organizing for service 3,000 miles away from home. Within less than 10 days after that event occurred which set in motion this great program of war the Secretary of the Treasury and the President of the United States called upon Congress at once to proceed to the work of changing our tax laws so as to raise the additional revenue deemed to be necessary. That work was begun, I say, within 10 days after the declaration of war.

But, Mr. President, owing to the delays that we all understand to be necessarily incident to the preparation and enactment of important legislation of this character, with all the speed that could be put behind that measure, Congress was not able to pass it until the month of October. If we had known that this additional revenue was needed before the beginning of the taxable year—before the Congress of the preceding December assembled—we would have started preparations for the enactment of that legislation at the very beginning of that session, just as I say it is our duty now, at the very beginning of this session, to enact legislation in order to remove the burdens of taxation that have been found by reason of changing conditions to be unnecessary.

Again, Mr. President, in the case of the pending revenue legislation we did not begin action upon it until several months of the taxable year had expired. Why? Because it was not definitely determined until late in the first half of the year that in order to play the part that the situation in Europe demanded we should play, it would be necessary greatly to enlarge, indeed, almost to double our Army; to raise, instead of an Army of 2,000,000 men for overseas service, an Army of over 4,000,000 men for service abroad.

Senators know how dark and discouraging the situation was at that time. Senators will recall the urgent appeals that came to us from abroad for additional help, for additional men, for additional supplies; Senators well know how we all felt that unless we responded and responded promptly to those appeals the day was lost; that civilization was jeopardized; and that, instead of the glorious victory in which we now exult we might possibly at an early day be compelled to face a great and irretrievable world disaster. For that reason, Mr. President, it was

decided in the middle of the year that we must increase our taxes for the year 1918—for this taxable year.

So we commenced work upon a bill for that purpose. That bill ought to have been passed during the last session. It is a great mistake that it was not passed during the last session. If it had passed then the existing confusion about this proposal to adopt rates for 1919 now would not trouble us. If a tax law for 1918 had been passed as a separate measure then I think there would have been no confusion about our duty with reference to providing right now for the reduction of the taxes payable in the year 1920 but applicable to the earnings of 1919. The confusion grows out of the fact that by reason of our failure and inability to pass the pending measure before the beginning of the present session of Congress it becomes necessary to pass it during this session of Congress. We are simply linking to the revenue bill of 1918 an amendment to accomplish what, under other conditions, we would have accomplished properly by an independent bill.

I wish Senators would think about this matter in terms of two distinct bills. One properly should have been passed during the present taxable year and before Congress met in December. Public interest, in fact, would have been better served if the bill could have been passed at the beginning of the year instead of at the end of the year; but it could not be passed then because of conditions which Congress could not control, and it had to be passed, if at all, toward the end of the year. Now I ask that Senators consider the two propositions separately, as if the pending revenue bill fixing taxes and rates for the calendar year 1918 had passed and the proposal to fix taxes and rates for 1919—payable in 1920—were an independent proposition having no relation to the pending bill.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEWIS in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. SIMMONS. I will yield; but I would rather the Senator would allow me to proceed, as I am discussing the question generally.

Mr. KING. I will yield to the desire of the Senator.

Mr. SIMMONS. When I get to the details I will be very glad to yield to the Senator, and will do so now if he insists upon it.

Mr. KING. No.

Mr. SIMMONS. I now reach the question, Mr. President, of a reduction in war taxation. If we pass this bill without special provision for the fiscal year 1920, the profits and incomes earned during the taxable year 1919 will be liable for a tax based upon an \$8,000,000,000 levy. We also know now, in the beginning of the session of Congress, before the taxable year 1919 has been entered upon, that the requirements of the Government for the fiscal year 1920 make it possible and proper to lop off \$2,000,000,000 from the proposed tax for the fiscal year 1919.

The minority Senators—I have not seen their report, but speak from what was said in the committee—the minority contend that it is sufficient if these tax reductions be made at some later session of Congress. When this Congress adjourns on the 4th of March next, unless the President, under the authority conferred upon him by the Constitution, shall call an extraordinary session, there will be no future Congress to enter upon this work until next December; and if this work be postponed until the first Monday of next December, it would probably be late in the spring of 1920 before the taxes would be imposed upon the earnings of 1919.

What is going to happen in the interval? How are producers to fix prices in the interval? Does anybody doubt that when they come to perform this function the principle of self-protection, as well as the principle of selfishness, will prompt or require them to place upon their products a price commensurate with a tax levy of \$6,000,000,000, the tax levy provided by the then existing law?

It is said that business people, the manufacturers and the producers, have confidence that in due time this revision and reduction will be made. Ah, Mr. President, the business men of this country are not going to dispose of their products at prices based upon an uncertainty of that kind. They will say, "It is too much to ask us to take the risk. We must assume that the profits upon these goods are going to be taxed upon the basis of the existing law," and they will mark up their profits to conform to this tax and not mark them down to conform to uncertain reduction that they are promised in the future.

What will be the result, Mr. President, if that is done? The effect will be that when the taxable year 1919 shall have expired the great industries of this country will have in their possession \$2,000,000,000 already collected from the people in excess of what they ought to have collected if the tax rate had

been reduced to the level of the requirements of the Government. After these unnecessary taxes have been passed on to the consumers and been paid by them the minority would remit them not to the consumers who paid them, but to those to whom they paid them in the increased prices of their necessary purchases. If so remitted, the people who paid those taxes will not get their money back nor will the Government get it. Does the minority desire to bring about this situation simply in order that a new Congress of different political control shall have the opportunity of performing the gracious service of relieving the great industries of this country from \$2,000,000,000 in taxes, paid indirectly by the people in the increased prices of the necessary things they have bought? The mere statement of the question ought to be sufficient answer to it.

And why, Mr. President, should we not right now proceed to make these reductions? The revenue act of 1916, though it was not approved until the 8th day of September, was passed within eight days of the passage of the increased Army and naval appropriation bills of that year, showing that the consideration of that bill went along in the two Houses contemporaneously with the consideration of the appropriation bills on account of which those increased revenues were laid and levied.

The revenue act of October 3, 1917, followed almost upon the heels of the passage of the appropriations which these increased levies were made to pay. And this year, Mr. President, when, in the latter part of May, we began the consideration of the pending revenue bill, did we not consider it contemporaneously with the consideration of the greatly increased appropriation bills which it was found necessary to pass because of the change in our military and naval policy? We did not wait until the appropriations had been made to begin the preparation of a bill to raise additional revenue on account of those appropriations, which at that stage were largely estimates. Indeed, not all of them were estimated for when work on the revenue bill began. Even after that work began large additional estimates came in.

What were we doing during the last session of the present Congress? The most of our time was spent in passing appropriation bills for the fiscal year 1918 and in changing the revenue law in order to raise the money to meet those appropriation bills. Now a new session of Congress has opened. The time for making appropriations to meet the expenditures for the fiscal year 1920 is here. The estimates are here, much more full and much more reliable than the estimates that were before the Congress when we began the consideration of the present revenue act in April, 1917. In reducing the eight-billion to a six-billion-dollar tax budget for the fiscal year 1919 we are proceeding upon the revised estimates of the Secretary of the Treasury, based upon estimates made to him by the different departments of the Government. Are these estimates of reductions in expenditures for this fiscal year so absolutely reliable, so definite and certain that we can afford to cut off two billions of dollars from the revenue bill for 1919 and run no risk, while the estimates made for the fiscal year 1920, which are also in, are so unreliable, so vague and elusive, deceitful, inadequate, and insufficient that we can not afford to do with reference to the expenditures for 1920 the same thing that we propose to do with reference to 1919 in this very enactment?

Oh, Mr. President, let me say that, having considered the revised estimates of the departments and the Secretary for the fiscal year 1920, the estimates for 1920, in my humble judgment, are not less certain and reliable, but much more certain and reliable than the estimates upon which the reductions for the year 1919 are based. I think this could be demonstrated from the figures and the facts.

Are they reliable? What did the Secretary of the Treasury tell us about his estimates for 1919—his estimate that the expenditures could be properly regarded as reducible from twenty-four billions to eighteen billions, making one-third of that amount six billions instead of eight billions?

Mr. SMOOT. Our appropriations were thirty-six billions.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; and our expenditures, our estimates for expenditures, and our provision for raising taxes to meet these expenditures have little to do with appropriations. Taxes are controlled by the expenditures, not by appropriations; and in these war times we seem to have adopted the policy of raising one-third as much by taxation as is necessary to defray the expenditures.

The Secretary told the committee that his estimate of eighteen billion expenditures for the fiscal year 1919, upon the basis of which he recommends a six billion instead of an eight billion tax levy for the fiscal year 1919, and on which advice the committee acted with substantial unanimity, was nothing but an enlightened estimate. Some say he used the words "enlightened guess," but what he said was "an enlightened estimate."

He explained to us the difficulties. How could he make estimates under existing conditions with absolute certainty? Who can tell how much of these prospective expenditures may now legitimately and properly be lopped off? Who can look into the future and see how many of these so-called war contracts can be canceled, and how much, if they are canceled, the Government will be necessarily and properly required to pay by way of damage and reparation? Who can tell, Mr. President, how soon the soldiers that are in Europe will be brought home, and how many of them can be discharged during the fiscal year in which we are now operating? Who can tell what will be the salvage the Government may reasonably expect to realize within this fiscal year from the sale of the enormous stock of war materials of all characters and kinds which the cessation of war makes it possible to dispose of? Those are problems which can not be treated with certainty, and those were the problems which confronted the Secretary of the Treasury in making the estimates for 1919 upon which we are acting—acting with the unanimous consent of the minority, as well as the majority, of the committee.

Now, Mr. President, compare them with the possible expenditures for 1920. I defy any man to prove that the elements of doubt and uncertainty attaching to the estimates of the possible expenditures for the fiscal year 1920 are any greater than the elements of doubt and uncertainty which attach to the future expenditures of the present fiscal year.

But, Mr. President, the estimates for 1920 are in. They are in the possession of the Committees on Appropriations of this body and the House, and the latter committee is preparing legislation based upon them at this very minute. They will be passed in all probability, at least they are likely to pass at this session of Congress. According to nearly every precedent of this body we have passed the bills to increase the revenue contemporaneously with the passage of the bills appropriating the revenue, and in the name of common sense, if it is proper to adopt such legislation contemporaneously when increases are made, is it not as much if not more appropriate to pass the legislation reducing taxes contemporaneously with legislation reducing expenditures? Any other course would seem to contravene the almost universal custom to reduce taxes when expenditures are reduced.

[At this point Mr. SIMMONS was interrupted by the expiration of the morning hour and afterwards yielded to Mr. FLETCHER.]

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, we have now reached a point in the presentation of the work of the committee with reference to the revenue bill where the subject matter becomes rather uninteresting.

The bill as it came from the House made a very necessary and important change in the present law with reference to income taxes. The present law has two income-tax schedules, making it necessary to calculate the tax on incomes according to the rates in two separate schedules. The House very properly combined these two systems of income taxation into one in this bill. This change will be a great relief to the ordinary taxpayer and will add greatly to the ease and simplicity of the administration of the law.

The House bill—and the Senate had not changed it in that respect—is constructed upon the general lines of the present law. While there are many amendments that do not relate directly to the rates, the general plan has been to retain the structure of the present law and increase the rates, so as to provide for the additional amount of revenue estimated to be necessary.

The committee suggests several changes in the surtax sections of the House bill. It seemed to your committee that the surtax provisions of the House bill were framed without sufficient reference to uniformity and the graduated increases were rather arbitrary in some instances.

For instance, the rates in the House bill start at 2 per cent, and are increased by steps, varying from 1 to 7 per cent, until the maximum of 65 per cent is reached upon incomes in excess of \$5,000,000. These steps bear no fixed relation to each other. For example, incomes between \$20,000 and \$30,000 would pay 8 per cent more tax than incomes between \$10,000 and \$15,000, while incomes between \$90,000 and \$100,000 would pay only 2 per cent more than incomes between \$80,000 and \$90,000. Your committee sought to remedy that by beginning with a surtax of 1 per cent upon incomes in excess of \$5,000 and not in excess of \$6,000, and advancing to a rate of 48 per cent upon incomes in excess of \$98,000 and not in excess of \$100,000. This advance under the Senate provision is uniform, made by the addition of 1 per cent for each additional \$2,000 of income until the \$100,000 bracket is reached. Between \$100,000 and a million dollars the increases are less uniform and necessarily

sonewhat arbitrary, reaching 65 per cent at a million dollars, above which the tax remains at 65 per cent. The general effect of those changes is to reduce slightly the surtax upon incomes under \$100,000 and to increase slightly the surtax upon incomes in excess of \$100,000. The aggregate effect upon the revenue derived is very small. I think it is estimated that the amount that will be realized from surtaxes will be only \$23,000,000 less under the Senate rates than under the House rates—\$23,000,000 in an aggregate of something over \$1,000,000,000.

The Finance Committee made no change in the normal rate provided in the House bill for the fiscal year 1919 on individuals; but we did make a very important change in the tax rates provided by the House bill for the incomes of corporations. The House bill provides a 12 per cent rate on that part of the net income of corporations which is distributed in dividends or paid in the discharge of interest-bearing obligations or in the purchase of liberty bonds issued after September 1, 1918, and imposed a rate of 18 per cent on the balance. That is to say, while earnings devoted to certain uses other than distribution were exempted from the 6 per cent differential, many other equally essential uses, such as addition to plant for purposes of further production, were not similarly recognized. A discrimination was made between the rate on income used in paying off the obligations of the corporation and the rate imposed on earnings retained for the necessary expansion and development of the plant or for the maintenance of its equipment in a state of efficiency. A distinction was made between the rate on income invested by the corporation in liberty bonds and income of the corporation invested in necessary improvements.

The committee has provided for a uniform tax upon the net incomes of corporations, this rate being 12 per cent for the 1918 taxable year and 8 per cent for succeeding years (sec. 230). Under the House bill the 12 per cent rate applied only to so much of the net income as was distributed in dividends, or paid in the discharge of interest-bearing obligations, or in the purchase of liberty bonds issued after September 1, 1918, and on the balance the rate was 18 per cent. While certain essential uses of earnings for purposes other than distribution were recognized, many other such uses of earnings equally essential, such as for additions to plant for purposes of further production, were not recognized. Failure to permit without penalty all legitimate uses of earnings for financing corporations seemed inconsistent with the policy which has in the past been actually followed by well-managed corporations and which has been urged by the War Finance Corporation and the Capital Issues Committee. To retain the differential rate while exempting from the extra tax all income used by the corporation for legitimate purposes other than distribution would, however, make the law difficult of administration, because it would involve review by the Treasury Department of too many detailed questions of the administrative policy of individual corporations. These and other considerations, among which was the fact that corporations are subject to the war excess-profits tax, to which individuals and partnerships are not subject moved the committee to restore the flat-rate system.

Experience has demonstrated the practical impossibility of conducting and maintaining corporate enterprise on a successful basis if all of its annual net earnings are distributed to the stockholders, and this has led to a practice which is practically universal of retaining a reasonable part of these earnings in the business for purposes of betterment, development, and progressive efficiency. This practice has contributed immensely to the rapid and efficient expansion of our great industrial system and should be encouraged and not penalized. It is not difficult to see that the small loss of revenue from the surtax will be more than counterbalanced by this provision, so to speak, of an automatic efficiency and development fund.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. KELLOGG. Is it possible to place surtaxes upon corporations? Surtaxes are measured by the total income; and a corporation having a total income of a million dollars would pay, say, 65 per cent of it as a surtax, while it might not be earning any more than 5 per cent on its capital.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will say to the Senator that it is absolutely impracticable to impose a surtax on the lump earnings of a corporation. You can not do it for the reason the Senator gives, and you can not do it for many other reasons which I think probably it is not necessary to go into, but which I could elaborate at some length.

Mr. President, there is one matter that gave your committee a great deal of concern. Senators will remember that when the present law was under discussion we all felt that we could not

with justice subject what is known as a personal service corporation—that is, a corporation which derives its income chiefly through the activities of the members of the corporation, and whose capital, if any, is a mere incident—to an excess-profits tax, a tax fundamentally based upon the theory that the taxpayer was entitled to a certain exemption based on his invested capital. The question then was how to deal with them. The Senate, as you will recall, thought that the best way to deal with them was to exempt them from the excess-profits tax; but in conference it was insisted that, in addition to the income taxes, these corporations should pay a direct tax as a substitute for the excess-profits tax. This was agreed to and the rate fixed at 8 per cent of the net income. That provision of the present law has provoked much adverse criticism, and is an unsatisfactory way of solving the admittedly difficult problem. The House bill retains the method of the present law and increases the rate to 20 per cent.

The committee, after due consideration, recommend as a fair solution of the problem that this class of corporations be exempt from the profits taxes, but that they be taxed exactly as the bill proposes to tax partnerships. That is to say, that, like a partnership, all of the earnings of such corporation be treated for surtax as distributed whether actually distributed or not. The earnings of such corporations are assigned to the individual members according to the amount of stock held and included in their income-tax returns.

Another very important amendment recommended by the committee may vitally affect the question of the undistributed earnings of corporations. Undoubtedly there are corporations in this country which, without any regard to the requirements of the business, make a habit of retaining a large and unnecessary part of the earnings in the business, or pretending to retain it for business purposes, for the purpose of escaping the surtax. There is no doubt but that there are a number of so-called close corporations, corporations with only a small number of stockholders, that have been organized primarily for the purpose of availing themselves of the privilege of retention to escape surtaxes upon their earnings.

The present law has a provision that would seem adequate to meet that situation, but it fails in adequacy by reason of the use of just one word. It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to determine whether these earnings are improperly retained; and if he shall find that they are fraudulently retained or fraudulently availed of for the purpose of escaping taxes they can be taxed as if distributed to the stockholders. The law has been ineffectual because of difficulty in securing evidence to establish fraud. We have, therefore, stricken from the provision of the present law the word "fraudulent"; and it is the belief of the department that as a result the administrative branch of the Government will be able to effectually cope with these fraudulent practices and schemes for evading the tax.

Mr. President, besides the changes to which I have referred, your committee has made quite a number of important amendments intended to relieve against hardships and injustice that have been disclosed in the administration of the present law as the result of the rigid, inflexible definitions of invested capital.

As a result, in the administration of the present law, the department, as these cases have developed, has been forced, to avoid manifest injustice, to resort to alleviative regulations and constructions.

Your committee has adopted and written into the bill the substance of some of these regulations so as to give them the force and effect of law. We have also recommended a series of relief amendments relating to amortization, depletion, and shrinkage in inventories, which, if ratified by the Senate and not eliminated in conference, I think will answer to a very large extent the criticisms of the present law and correct many discriminations and inequalities which have confronted the department in the administration of the existing law. In addition, the committee has prepared a general amendment which we have been in the habit in the committee of speaking of as the relief amendment, authorizing the commissioner to classify in groups certain exceptional cases which seemed to require special treatment to safeguard the taxpayers against injustice. Every corporation which brings itself within the provisions of those classifications is given the benefit, in computing its deductions, of the like or "similar business" section of the bill; that is to say, it will be entitled to the same percentage of deductions that representative concerns in the same line of business are found to be entitled to.

There is another amendment of similar character to the one just mentioned which I regard of great importance. The House in imposing the war-profits tax realized the fact that if the tax-

payer is to be taxed 80 per cent upon his net earnings he must be given a very liberal exemption. An 80 per cent tax based upon the principle of an arbitrary exemption of 8 per cent upon invested capital would be a very heavy tax. But when you apply that high rate only to the earnings in excess of the prewar earnings it may or it may not be heavy, according to the size of the prewar earnings.

In any event, the House recognized that liberal allowances must be assured if an 80 per cent rate was imposed, and it seems to have adequately provided for every case except the case of newly established business. An old established business always has an advantage over newly inaugurated business and nothing should be done to increase or accentuate that advantage. Under the House bill an old or prewar business is allowed a deduction of not less than 10 per cent, while a new business is allowed a deduction of not more than 10 per cent. That evidently puts the new business struggling into existence upon an unfair basis of competition with old and established business concerns.

To meet the apparent equities of this situation the committee recommends an amendment providing that in the case of new business the taxpayer should be entitled to the same percentage of deduction as representative corporations engaged in the same line of business, so that if the average deduction of representative business is 12 per cent, or 15 per cent, or 16 per cent, or whatever per cent, the new business is entitled to the same percentage of deduction, thus placing the taxpayer upon a parity with his competitors in the business.

Mr. President, the recommended sundry amendments liberalizing the amortization and the depletion provisions of the House bill—but I will defer discussion as to them until they are reached in the orderly consideration of the bill because of the fact that a proper presentation of them would require more time than I wish to consume in this preliminary statement.

There is another important amendment relating to life insurance companies to which I wish to call brief attention. Speaking personally, from the beginning of these revenue bills up to the present day nothing has given me more trouble than the problem of properly adjusting taxes upon life insurance companies. The committee, with the very able assistance of members of the tax advisory board established in the Treasury Department, and after consultation with many representatives of life insurance companies, recommend an amendment which embodies a scheme for taxing the incomes of life insurance companies which, it is thought, is just and equitable to all interests. The tax is in form an income tax, but is imposed upon a net income defined with special reference to the peculiar conditions of the business of life insurance. Roughly, it consists of the gross income from interest, dividends, and rents, less tax-free interest, investment expenses, and taxes and other expenses paid exclusively in connection with real estate owned by the company. In the case of a domestic life insurance company there is also a specific deduction of \$2,000. Thus the tax falls upon the true income of the company—that is, its income from investments—and the rate is so fixed that this tax takes the place of the income tax, war excess-profits tax, capital-stock tax, and the tax on the issuance of policies. It will yield considerably more revenue than the taxes which it is designed to replace, and has the great merit of simplicity and certainty. Above all, it avoids the almost insuperable difficulty of defining the invested capital of a life insurance company for purposes of the war excess-profits tax.

Early in the present session there was much controversy in the committee and on the floor of the Senate, resulting in able constitutional arguments in this chamber by Senators THOMAS, KELLOGG, and KNOX as to the constitutionality of a Federal tax on the salaries of certain State and Federal officials and on the interest of bonds of the States and municipal subdivisions thereof. After mature deliberation the committee decided to recommend an amendment striking from the House bill the provision taxing incomes from State and municipal bonds and modifying the provision as to salaries. It imposes an income tax on all gains, wages, salaries, and so forth, without differentiation. We leave the constitutional question to be settled by the courts when it is raised.

We have also exempted the proceeds of life insurance policies paid upon the death of the insured. The House bill exempts these proceeds from taxation only when paid to an individual beneficiary or to the estate of the insured. We allow the exemption to whomsoever the insurance is payable. I do not think I need to further discuss this subject.

Another exemption recommended by the committee relates to the salaries of soldiers and sailors. We remove the limitation of \$3,500 in the House bill, but restrict its operation by adding a provision which limits this exemption to the period of the war and apply to those only in active service.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEWIS in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. SIMMONS. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask the Senator what he means by the phrase "active service"? Does that apply to the distinguished gentlemen who are in the department here?

Mr. SIMMONS. That may be a matter of administration. It was not intended that the class referred to by the Senator should have the exemption.

Now, Mr. President, I am going to hurry through the excess-profits tax section of the bill.

Mr. POMERENE. If I may ask the Senator another question for information, on page 31, section 215, under the title "Items not deductible," you have first family expenses, next amount paid out for new building, next amount expended in restoring property; and then paragraph (d) reads:

Premiums paid on any life insurance policy covering the life of any officer or employee, or of any person financially interested in any trade or business carried on by the taxpayer, when the taxpayer is directly or indirectly a beneficiary under such policy.

Is that so drawn as to include premiums which are paid on what is known as group insurance as well?

Mr. SIMMONS. That describes what is, I think, called group insurance.

Mr. POMERENE. I was now speaking of the items that are not deductible when I referred to this, and among those items not deductible are premiums paid on life insurance. I am not claiming that it should, I am trying to get the construction the Senator places on the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the Senator give me the page?

Mr. POMERENE. Page 31. One of the controversies which we had up before was whether or not premiums paid by a corporation for insurance on the lives of its officers should be subject to a tax or not. In the past bill after it finally came out of conference it was so drawn that the amount paid in premiums would not be deductible, which I think was right. I was not clear in my mind as to whether this paragraph was so framed as to include within the words "premiums paid on life insurance" such premiums as might be payable on what is known as group insurance.

Mr. SIMMONS. Group insurance is deductible except where the taxpayer is directly or indirectly a beneficiary under the policy. That is the meaning of the section the Senator read.

Mr. President, I do not wish to take much time with reference to the war excess-profits taxes. We have retained the rates of the House bill on war profits, but we have slightly reduced the excess-profits tax rates. There was a controversy in the Ways and Means Committee, I am advised, with reference to the matter of increasing the excess-profits tax rates. The Secretary of the Treasury, and perhaps other Government officials connected with the administration of the tax laws, insisted that the excess-profits rates of the present law should not be increased, but that committee decided to increase them and the House ratified that action. There are some large corporations which, while making very large profits on account of large prewar earnings, would not be caught under the 80 per cent war-profits bracket of the bill. They will be reached, if at all, under the excess-profits brackets.

There are several very famous cases of this character. There is one great automobile company, which was making before the war such enormous profits that, under any war-tax scheme which allows a deduction to the full extent of prewar earnings, would pay practically no tax at all. The profits of that concern are now on a parity with the average war profits. The House thought—and with this thought your committee agreed—that as this class of taxpayers would escape a war-profit tax, and we are increasing taxes generally, there ought to be a substantial increase in the excess-profits taxes. But your committee thought the House increase was too great, and it accordingly recommends the middle course between the idea of the Secretary of the Treasury and the idea of the Ways and Means Committee of the House; and presents an amendment to the bill which reduces the House rate, but which materially increases the rate of the present law.

I am advised that in the administration of the present law it has been discovered that what is known as the small corporation has suffered manifest discrimination in the matter of excess-profits taxes; and that condition is not exceptional, but is general with respect to corporations of small earning capacity.

We have sought to relieve against that situation, Mr. President, by an amendment changing very materially the provision for the same purpose which was adopted in the other House. To accomplish the purpose in view, the House provided a limit of

not more than 35 per cent where the capital invested was not in excess of \$25,000, and a limit of not more than 40 per cent where the invested capital was not in excess of \$50,000. It is apparent, Mr. President, that while these provisions would afford some relief it would apply to only a very small number of corporations and would fall far short of meeting the situation. We think we have provided a scheme of dealing with these small corporations which is much more effective and much more equitable.

Mr. POMERENE. In what part of the bill is that?

Mr. SIMMONS. It is the excess-profits tax part of the bill. I do not have it here by sections. The amendment, however, provides a limit of 30 per cent on the income of corporations in excess of \$3,000 (which is the exemption they are entitled to) and not in excess of \$20,000; so that we apply the 30 per cent limit—whether there is a capital of \$25,000 or a capital of \$50,000, or more, so long as the resulting taxable income falls below \$20,000. Twenty thousand dollars represents a good income upon a considerable capitalization. It would be 8 per cent upon \$250,000, I believe.

Mr. THOMAS. That is correct.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina has stated that, as a matter of practice, there has been a discrimination against the small corporation and in favor of the larger corporation.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes. That is what we were advised and that is what I believe.

Mr. POMERENE. What I want to know is how this has come about. The Senator from North Carolina has stated it as a fact, but I am at a loss to understand how it was brought about so that there would be this discrimination against the smaller corporation and in favor of the larger one.

Mr. SIMMONS. Speaking generally, because, their capital being small, their basis of exemption is so small that the bulk of their income becomes subject to the high bracket rates.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield.

Mr. KELLOGG. I desire to say that the Senator from Ohio will find that there are a great many small corporations with a capital of \$10,000, \$25,000, or \$50,000, where the principal stockholders give their entire time to the business and where the capital, while it is necessary to the business, bears but a small relation to the real earnings of the company. I know of many such corporations who were in the tax returns two years ago.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is true.

Mr. KELLOGG. And by reason of their capital being turned over rapidly and the personal service of their officers, who are also stockholders, or more like partners than stockholders, their earnings were very large and the tax even last year took most of their earnings.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator will find many corporations with only \$20,000 capital with a net income greater than the capital invested, whose exemption would be infinitesimal because of their small capital. In such a case the tax without this provision would be excessive.

The Senate committee has made a number of important amendments to the definition of "invested capital." It would take me quite a time to give the reasons for these changes. And while some of them are important I do not think I shall take the time of the Senate this afternoon to discuss them—they will be fully discussed when reached.

There are two other provisions of the bill, Mr. President, to which I wish to refer. Then I think I shall conclude. I refer to the provision with reference to consolidated returns.

There is nothing in the present law which expressly authorizes such returns, but the department has by construction permitted them as being within its authority. The House bill contains a provision expressly prohibiting such consolidation. I am advised that the Ways and Means Committee were very doubtful about this, and probably would not have inserted the prohibition in the bill if the representatives of the department had been able to say to that committee that permitting this consolidation did not result in a substantial diminution of the revenue from the different units of the consolidated concerns. Since the House committee acted, the question of the effect of allowing these consolidations on the revenue has been carefully investigated by the experts of the department, and your committee was confidently advised that as a result of these investigations it was found that in the aggregate the revenues would not be adversely affected by requiring consolidation.

So far as its immediate effect is concerned consolidation increases the tax in some cases and reduces it in other cases, but its general and permanent effect is to prevent evasion, which can not be successfully blocked in any other way. Among affiliated corporations it frequently happens that the accepted intercompany accounting assigns too much income or invested capital to company A and not enough to company B. This may make the total tax for the corporation too much or too little. If the former, the company hastens to change its accounting method; if the latter, there is every inducement to retain the old accounting procedure, which benefits the affiliated interests, even though such procedure was not originally adopted for the purpose of evading taxation. As a general rule, therefore, improper arrangements which increase the tax will be discontinued, while those which reduce the tax will be retained.

Moreover, a law which contains no requirement for consolidation puts an almost irresistible premium on a segregation or a separate incorporation of activities which would normally be carried as branches of one concern. Increasing evidence has come to light demonstrating that the possibilities of evading taxation in these and allied ways are becoming familiar to the taxpayers of the country. While the committee is convinced that the consolidated return tends to conserve, not to reduce, the revenue, the committee recommends its adoption not primarily because it operates to prevent evasion of taxes or because of its effect upon the revenue, but because the principle of taxing as a business unit what in reality is a business unit is sound and equitable and convenient both to the taxpayer and to the Government. A year's trial of the consolidated return under the existing law demonstrated the advisability of conferring upon the commissioner explicit authority to require such returns.

Mr. President, the Senate committee has made one other amendment of some importance that does not require any elaboration. The House bill with reference to payment of income and profit taxes in installments provided for payment in three installments, the last of the three installments becoming due sometime in June. We have changed that, and provided for payment in four installments, the last of the four installments becoming due in December. The House required all three installments to be paid during the first half of the calendar year, while we extend the four installments over the whole calendar year. That is the difference. Of course, it can readily be seen that a part of the taxes set apart for the fiscal year 1919, under that provision, would not be paid until after June 30, when that fiscal year is ended, and, of course, in that situation the Secretary of the Treasury would probably have to resort to the sale of certificates until these installments fall due; but I do not think that is a difficulty that needs to give us any special concern.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I wish to express my gratification that the committee has arranged to make the taxes payable in installments. Last year they were all made payable in one sum, and when an effort was made by some of us to have them made payable in three or four installments a few of the wisecracks at the Treasury Department thought that it could not be done. I am glad to know, however, that the Finance Committee has found a way to do that very simple thing.

In that connection, this thought has occurred to me: I have heard various statements made as to whether or not this bill was to pass or any bill was to pass at this session. I do not know anything about that. I hope that some bill will pass; but if it does not pass, as a last resort, I hope that there will be some change made in the old law so as to permit of the payment of these taxes in installments. It ought to be done; otherwise, we are going to embarrass a great many of the smaller manufacturing concerns in the country.

Mr. SIMMONS. I was aware of the Senator's views about this matter, having had many conferences with him, and I have always sympathized with him in his view.

Mr. President, I shall not discuss the changes which we have made in the section of the bill relating to estate taxes, although they are very substantial. In brief, I may say that the difference is that the House provided for an estate tax while the Senate amendment provides for an inheritance tax. The House bill taxed directly the gross estate. The Senate amendment taxes the part coming to each beneficiary under the law, or the will of the decedent. The rates prescribed are very much less than those of the House bill. Your committee did not and does not feel that the Federal Government ought to impose upon inheritances or estates such a heavy tax as would make it practically impossible for the States to avail themselves of this source of taxation without making the joint taxes of the Federal and the State Governments oppressive if not largely confiscatory.

I shall not stop to discuss the changes made in excise, stamp, and special taxes. They can be seen in the bill, and nearly all of them are self-explanatory and do not require any statement.

Mr. President, the committee has made just two other amendments of special importance. I am not going to stop to discuss them in detail, but will content myself with a brief reference to them. I refer to the child-labor amendment—

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator a question regarding the House provision concerning what is commonly known as the tax on luxuries. That is stricken from this bill, is it not?

Mr. SIMMONS. That is stricken out.

Mr. KENYON. Has the Senator discussed that at all?

Mr. SIMMONS. I have not discussed that.

Mr. KENYON. Does the Senator propose to discuss it?

Mr. SIMMONS. No; I do not. There are two kinds of luxury taxes in the bill. There is one that is imposed upon things that are, because of their nature and use, ordinarily regarded as luxuries because they are not necessities. We have not stricken all of those taxes out, but have stricken some of them out.

Mr. KENYON. I refer to the tax on high-priced clothing and articles of that kind as a tax on luxuries. That is stricken out?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; I am coming to that. The other class of so-called luxuries comprise such things as are not, in essence, luxuries at all, but only become subject to that designation when the price is very high—when the price paid is such as only the rich or of liberal means can ordinarily afford.

Mr. KENYON. The committee has stricken those out.

Mr. SIMMONS. We have stricken those out.

Mr. KENYON. They ought to stay in.

Mr. SIMMONS. I hardly think so; but I do not desire to go into that discussion now. I should be very glad, however, to hear the Senator upon that question if he thinks those taxes ought to stay in the bill.

Mr. KENYON rose.

Mr. SIMMONS. Not now, if the Senator please.

Mr. KENYON. I suppose it was a fundamental doctrine of the Democratic party that luxuries should be taxed.

Mr. SIMMONS. Well, we have retained the tax on luxuries, but these are not luxuries; they are necessities—clothing and similar things.

Mr. President, the child-labor amendment ought not to be passed by with a few observations, and yet on account of the lateness of the hour and my desire to finish this amendment this afternoon I shall consume but a few minutes in discussing it at this time. I wish to say with respect to that matter, however, that I was not in agreement with my colleagues upon the committee. That does not mean that I am opposed to child-labor legislation, but by that I mean only this, and nothing more, that I do not believe that this is a matter which should be dealt with by the Federal Government. I think under the Constitution it involves the exercise of a power which rests exclusively with the States. That was the reason of my opposition in the committee. The committee has decided against my contention, and I know full well the views of a large majority in the Senate coincides with those of a majority of the committee, and I yielded gracefully and shall content myself with registering my protest. I do not feel, however, friendly to legislation—I want to say that now—and I do not care what its character is—

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. Pardon me; let me finish the sentence—that is framed with a view of evading and defeating a constitutional limitation of power through the abuse of the taxing powers of the Government.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, when the Senator made the statement that he was going to stand by the committee on this proposition—

Mr. SIMMONS. I submit to the inevitable.

Mr. POMERENE. I thought the Senator made one of the ablest speeches I ever heard him make; and I am very sorry to hear him spoil it now by these last statements.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President. The Senator should be content when I confine myself to a conservative statement of the grounds of my unfriendliness to this kind of legislation, and gracefully as I can submit to the evident will and power of my associates and colleagues. We can evade the Constitution in the way proposed if we want to. It has been done in the past. It can be done again. There seems to be no way to prevent and defeat an evasion of a constitutional limitation upon the powers of Congress where the evasion is through an exercise of the taxing power.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question? I know he is weary, and I am not going to keep him

waiting; but can the Senator tell us how much would be raised by this tax on luxuries?

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator means the 20 per cent tax on luxuries?

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. About one hundred and eighty-four millions, I think. I may be mistaken about that, but I think that is the amount. The Senator means the 20 per cent taxes as they appear in the House bill?

Mr. KENYON. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think I am right about that; but, at any rate, it is quite a considerable amount.

Mr. President, the committee recommends important changes in the first and second class postal rates. It recommends an amendment effective after July 1, 1919, restoring the 2-cent rate on first-class mail matter, letter postage. Secondly, an amendment repealing the present zone system as to second-class matter (newspapers and periodicals), and substituting for it a tax of 1 cent a pound for delivery within the first and second zones (the first zone being 50 miles and the second zone 100 miles), and 1½ cents a pound for delivery in all other zones to be effective July 1, 1919.

I do not wish to enter upon a discussion of these amendments at this time further than to say the Senate committee, when the revenue act of October 3, 1917, was under consideration, struck the provision providing for the so-called zone system out of the bill, and the Senate sustained its action in this behalf, but the provision was restored in conference, under pressure. I do not know what will be the final result in case the Senate adopts the committee amendment to repeal this system; but a majority of the members of the committee felt so strongly about this matter that the committee did not feel it would be justified in failing to do everything possible, though it might eventuate in failure, to secure a repeal of that system of taxation.

At the conclusion of his speech Mr. SIMMONS said:

Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I ask that that motion be withheld for a moment. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] has a joint resolution which he wishes to have acted upon to-night.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina withhold his motion for a moment?

Mr. SIMMONS. Certainly.

HOUSING OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

Mr. HARDWICK. From the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds I submit a report (No. 620), accompanied by a joint resolution directing the United States Housing Corporation to suspend work upon all projects where construction is not more than 75 per cent completed and to cancel all contracts for furniture, and for other purposes. I desire to have the joint resolution read—it is very short—and I give notice that I shall then ask for its immediate consideration. It deals with the housing question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KING in the chair). The joint resolution will be read.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 194) directing the United States Housing Corporation to suspend work upon all projects where construction is not more than 75 per cent completed, and to cancel all contracts for furniture, and for other purposes, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas by the act approved May 16, 1918, the President was authorized to provide housing, local transportation, and other general community utilities for such industrial workers as are engaged in arsenals and other industries in the United States and industries connected with and essential to the national defense and their families, including employees of the United States whose duties require them to reside in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas acting under such powers, by direction of the President, a corporation, known as the United States Housing Corporation, was formed, which corporation has proceeded to enter into the construction of a large number of houses in various parts of the country; and Whereas one of the projects being carried out by the said United States Housing Corporation is the group of buildings on the depot plaza between the Capitol and the Union Station, in the District of Columbia; and

Whereas it will involve an expenditure of approximately \$400,000 to complete and furnish said group of buildings ready for operation, most of which would be saved to the Government if work is suspended; and

Whereas for all practical purposes the war has ended, the employees of the Government residing in the District of Columbia are being rapidly decreased, and there is therefore no necessity for the completion and operation of said buildings as being essential to the national defense for the use of Government employees; and

Whereas in other parts of the country said United States Housing Corporation proposes to proceed with the construction of a large number of buildings now only in the early stages of their construction: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc. That all work upon said group of buildings upon the plaza between the Capitol and the Union Station, in the District of Columbia, be suspended and all contracts made in reference thereto canceled, and the United States Housing Corporation, representing the Government of the United States in said construction, be instructed to cancel all said contracts.

SEC. 2. That the United States Housing Corporation, representing the Government of the United States, be, and the same hereby is, directed to suspend work upon all projects in which it is now engaged in all cases where the construction is not more than 75 per cent completed, and to cancel all contracts for furniture and to return, wherever possible, all unused furniture on hand or in transit.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Carolina is willing to lay aside temporarily the unfinished business, I should like the Senate to dispose of the joint resolution that I have just reported, because I think it means the salvage of large amounts of money for the Government. Every moment's delay is costly.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, does the Senator expect to have the joint resolution passed this evening?

Mr. HARDWICK. I hope so.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have no disposition to put off or delay the consideration of the joint resolution; but, as it stands, personally I feel very much opposed to portions of it, and I doubt very much whether we can dispose of it this evening. I do not want to be put in the attitude of objecting to its consideration, because I do not want to delay it a minute longer than may be necessary.

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not want to delay it. Of course, whenever we do dispose of it, we have got to meet just such questions as that. If we delay meeting them, I think it will cost the Government a large sum of money.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that; but the joint resolution has not even been printed, and I only know of it as I heard the Secretary read it. There are, however, parts of it that I believe it is unwise to pass. At least, I shall oppose it in the form in which the Senator has it now, and I shall want to be heard on it briefly.

Mr. HARDWICK. I want to give the Senator every opportunity to be heard. It is, of course, a serious responsibility that he is taking, because the daily waste is tremendous. The Senator understands that as well as I do.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; but it is also a serious responsibility, it seems to me, to ask for the passage of a joint resolution here without giving any opportunity to have anyone heard, and dispose of it here when it is time to adjourn now.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator from Georgia was simply asking for consideration of the joint resolution. The responsibility is up to the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. I have not objected to its consideration; but I want to suggest to the Senator that unless he expects the Senate to remain in session for some time he would not succeed in disposing of it to-night.

Mr. HARDWICK. I feel that it is my duty, on behalf of the committee, to move to take up the joint resolution; and the Senate can take whatever action it pleases on that motion.

Mr. SIMMONS and Mr. TRAMMELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. HARDWICK. There is only this about it: Of course, I would have to make the motion without regard to the unfinished business, because we know that the revenue bill is going to be considered for weeks and perhaps for months.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator from Georgia whether the joint resolution has been reported from a committee? I did not hear his first statement.

Mr. HARDWICK. The joint resolution is reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and, of course, it goes over for a day if any Senator wants to insist upon that course. I thought, however, that we might as well begin its consideration—it is not 5 o'clock yet—and let the Senate understand what the measure is, and let it go into the RECORD, so that at least it may be considered in the morning hour.

Mr. NORRIS. It is in the RECORD now. I think we can dispose of it in the morning hour to-morrow. The joint resolution will be in the RECORD. The Secretary has read it, and it will be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. HARDWICK. I think, then, Mr. President, that if no one objects I shall ask to have the report printed in the RECORD; and I give notice to the Senator from Nebraska and to other Senators interested that during the morning hour to-morrow I shall ask, on behalf of the committee, to take up this proposition for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be placed on the calendar and the report will be printed in the RECORD.

The report submitted by Mr. HARDWICK is as follows:

The undersigned members of a subcommittee of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds make this preliminary report direct to the Senate, because, in the opinion of the subcommittee, the Senate should be immediately advised regarding the matters herein contained.

Proceeding under Senate resolution 371, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, on the 5th day of December, 1918, convened, and by appropriate resolution authorized the chairman to appoint a subcommittee, of which the chairman of the committee should be chairman, to investigate the matters authorized by said resolution. Thereupon on the same day the chairman of the committee, Mr. REED, appointed the following subcommittee: Senator T. W. HARDWICK, Senator PARK TRAMMELL, Senator B. M. FERNALD, Senator J. I. FRANCE, and Senator I. L. LEXROTH.

The committee began taking evidence on the 6th day of December and are still continuing their investigation.

The evidence thus far taken has been largely confined to the housing projects at Washington, and especially the housing project on what is commonly known as the Depot Plaza grounds, being the grounds between the Capitol and the Union Station. This evidence has all been given by Mr. Otto M. Eldlitz, Director of Housing and Transportation of the Department of Labor and president of the United States Housing Corporation, a subsidiary corporation which was created to perform the functions of the bureau, or his associates, and is to the effect that the building project referred to consists of 12 dormitories, each of these dormitories being in fact doubled, so that they may be treated as 24 dormitory buildings, or 1,800 rooms.

In addition to the dormitories there is a hospital building, a laundry costing approximately \$35,000, and an administration building, containing a cafeteria, offices, and an assembly hall about 55 by 80.

The evidence shows that the dormitories are over 90 per cent finished. Some of them are completed or substantially completed. The administration building is likewise substantially completed. The hospital building is little more than inclosed, while the walls of the laundry building are in process of construction. The estimate of Mr. Eldlitz is that the entire project will cost when completed, including furnishings, approximately \$2,100,000; that it will cost approximately \$100,000 of labor to complete the buildings; that to furnish the buildings will cost about \$275,000; and that to complete the laundry, with machinery installed, will cost \$35,000. According to the revised estimates of Mr. Eldlitz, if the materials on hand, including the laundry machinery and furniture, were turned back (which Mr. Eldlitz thinks can be done at a small loss) and the project stopped in its present situation, approximately \$400,000 would be saved. That is to say, the Government would not have to pay out some \$400,000 which it will be compelled to do if it carries through the enterprise.

Mr. Eldlitz further estimates that the buildings will probably not be needed for a period longer than 12 months. Of course, it necessarily follows that the furniture and fixtures, being then in a secondhand state, they would not produce any very large salvage. As the number of occupants is estimated at 1,800 and the term of occupancy would not exceed 12 months, and as it is admitted that the enterprise, if completed, will cost the Government an additional \$400,000, it will be noted that the Government must expend for this period of 12 months' occupancy for each occupant approximately \$220.

This raises sharply the question whether the enterprise should be carried on and the Government should open what would be in reality a 1,800-room hotel, furnished and run by the Government, including meals, and at the same time should equip and furnish a laundry and do the laundry work and furnish an assembly hall at a cost of \$400,000 additional, the entire enterprise to be discontinued and probably wrecked at the end of 12 months. The answer to this question must be affected by the necessity existing.

It is admitted, first, that the war for all practical purposes is over and that there must be a large decrease of Government employees in the city of Washington. Your committee has sent out inquiries to ascertain how rapidly the number of Government employees brought to Washington because of the war will be diminished. Up to this time the replies to these inquiries are just beginning to come in. The replies already received indicate a reduction in the force of most of the departments heard from of from 15 to 20 per cent since November 11, the date of the signing of the armistice, and indications are that the force in all of the departments that were engaged in war work other than the Bureau of War-Risk Insurance, will be rapidly reduced.

It seems to your committee that the conclusion is irresistible, that in view of these conditions there is no necessity commensurate with the expenditure necessary for the completion of these buildings for the housing of employees, but, on the contrary, it would entail a tremendous loss upon the Government which can not be justified upon any sound business principles.

The attitude and purpose, however, of the United States Housing Corporation is to proceed to the full completion and operation of these buildings unless Congress shall otherwise order. Therefore, if any action is to be taken by Congress suspending these operations, it must be done immediately.

Your committee has made a preliminary investigation of a large number of other projects and from such preliminary investigation it is of the opinion that some projects are proposed to be completed that are even more indefensible than the one we have been considering. A number of these are in their very early stages and notably one which was brought to the attention of the committee where the foundations only of the group of buildings have been completed. Nevertheless the United States Housing Corporation proposes to fully complete those buildings at an expenditure of a very large sum of money, notwithstanding the fact that for all practical purposes the war has ended.

Your committee proposes to make further investigation of these matters, but would recommend that Congress take action suspending all operations until otherwise authorized by Congress, of all operations where the same have not been more than 65 per cent completed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I withdraw the motion I made a few minutes ago that the Senate adjourn. The Senator from Florida [Mr. TRAMMELL] indicates that he desires a short executive session. Therefore I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in

executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 11, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 10, 1918.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS.

Richard I. Lawson to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 38, with headquarters at Detroit, Mich., to fill an existing vacancy.

ASSISTANT APPRAISER OF MERCHANDISE.

Martin F. Tanahey, of New York City, to be assistant appraiser of merchandise in customs collection district No. 10, with headquarters at New York, N. Y., to fill an existing vacancy.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate December 10, 1918.

CHIEF OF BUREAU OF CONSTRUCTION AND REPAIR.

David W. Taylor to be Chief Constructor and Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair in the Department of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE.

Robert W. Davis to be register of the land office at Gainesville, Fla.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Perry M. Colson to be receiver of public moneys at Gainesville, Fla.

POSTMASTER.

GEORGIA.

Robert H. Wheless, Nashville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, December 10, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Rev. Earle Wilfley, of the Vermont Avenue Christian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, we pray Thee this morning that our pathway may be clear and that we may have the strength and courage to walk therein. Help us to see the right with unclouded eyes and obey the truth with fidelity. For our country and all its righteous causes we pray Thy blessing this morning; for all in authority and for those who do the right in the name of God, and for the good of man, for Thy name's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the general subject of retirement from Congress.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the general subject of retirement from Congress. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL SECURITY LEAGUE.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged report (No. 844) from the Committee on Rules.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 469.

Resolved, That a committee of seven Members be appointed by the Speaker of the House to investigate and make report as to the officers, membership, financial support, expenditures, general character, activities, and purposes of the National Security League, a corporation of New York, and of any associated organizations, that purport to be organized or engaged in or have been directly or indirectly engaged in the nomination, election, or defeat of Representatives in Congress during the year of 1918.

Said committee shall also inquire and ascertain whether charges affecting the loyalty of Representatives in Congress have been made by said organizations; and if so, by whom, and upon what information, testimony, or record; and it shall ascertain whether said organizations have complied with the provisions of law in the filing of expense accounts; and for such purposes it shall have power to send for persons and papers and enforce their appearance before said committee and to administer oaths; and the said committee or any subcommittee thereof shall have the right to sit at such times and places, in or out of the city of Washington, as the committee may deem advisable, and shall have the right to report at any time.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to secure an agreement as to the time for debate on the resolution. I have had no requests for time on this side.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. POUL. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I listened to the reading of the resolution, but do not know that I am able to interpret accurately its meaning. Does the resolution propose to limit the committee to finding out whether this Security League charged Members with disloyalty?

Mr. POUL. I think its scope is wider than that.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. There ought not to be any doubt about it. You can injure a candidate very seriously by misrepresenting the effect of his vote, even though the misrepresentation may not amount to charging him with disloyalty. I think the resolution should be read again.

Mr. POUL. The committee is authorized to "make a report as to the officers, membership, financial support, expenditures, general character, activities, and purposes of the National Security League, and of associated organizations." The scope, it seems to me, is sufficiently wide for a thorough inquiry.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Does the gentleman from North Carolina think the word "activities" is sufficient to cover what I have stated that I have in mind?

Mr. POUL. If "activities" does not do it, "purposes" would. Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. There ought not to be any question about it.

Mr. POUL. I can hardly see how the scope could be much wider.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. A man may have a purpose and do nothing to effect it, and so might a corporation.

Mr. POUL. This says, "general character, activities, and purposes."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the resolution again for the information of the House and of the Speaker.

The Clerk again reported the resolution.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POUL. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I rise to inquire what the committee intended to be included under the designation of "associated organizations"? In Wisconsin, if the gentleman will permit, there was formed in the city of Milwaukee, which had a State-wide scope, an organization known as the Patriotic Congressional League, one of the leaders of which was Willet Spooner, son of former Senator John M. Spooner, and a member of the executive committee of the National Security League. The National Security League of New York has a large membership and a branch in the State of Wisconsin. This Patriotic Congressional League had officers collecting thousands of dollars, and they failed to make any return under the State law which required a return of expenditures. My question is whether the Patriotic Congressional League, that had for its purpose the elimination from Congress of all the Members from the State of Wisconsin who voted against war, and which was one of the main purposes of the National Security League, would be investigated under the phraseology "associated organizations"?

This organization failed to comply with the requirements of the State law. In fact, they had emissaries going around the city of Milwaukee, to my knowledge, soliciting funds of \$49.50 from business interests, so that each individual would not be required to make an individual return under the State corrupt-practices act. Large manufacturers of war supplies stated that they would be willing to spend thousands of dollars to defeat me, and yet they made no returns. My direct query is whether under this phraseology the activities of the Patriotic Congressional League will be investigated?

Mr. POUL. I will say that the purpose of the committee was to include just such organizations as the gentleman refers to. My own opinion is that the wording of the resolution would include an organization such as described by the gentleman. If the wording is not comprehensive enough to include such an organization, the committee would be perfectly willing for it to be amended.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am glad to know that the purpose of the committee is to cover the investigation of organizations of that character.

Mr. POUL. Any associated organization for the identical purpose would come within the purview of the resolution.

Mr. STAFFORD. The word "associated" would limit the activity of the committee, because the committee would have to find at the outset that it was directly associated, and it might be difficult to prove or show the connection. Would not

the words "similar organizations" cover the point so as to include such an organization?

Mr. POUL. The committee would have no objection to adding the word "similar." May I ask how much time the gentleman from Kansas thinks he will desire?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I suggest we agree upon an hour on a side, and if the time is not called for after we get into the debate we will not use it.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I will ask unanimous consent that at the end of two hours, one hour to be controlled by myself and one hour by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], the previous question be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that he shall have one hour and the gentleman from Kansas one hour, and at the end of the two hours the previous question be considered as ordered.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will that preclude amendments, if that motion be adopted?

The SPEAKER. Amendments to the rule?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. To the resolution. Will we have to proceed immediately and vote on the resolution without amendment?

The SPEAKER. If the previous question is considered as ordered.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman from North Carolina modify his request so that amendments may be offered?

Mr. POUL. I will. I do not desire to cut amendments out.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Strike out the request for the previous question and ask that we go to a vote.

The SPEAKER. The ordinary rules of the House will prevail, and if the gentleman from North Carolina uses an hour and lets nobody else in to offer an amendment, and the gentleman from Kansas does the same thing, and at the end of the two hours the previous question is ordered, that is the end of the amendment business.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WINGO. Are we considering the resolution that has been reported by the Committee on Rules or are we considering the rule from that committee?

The SPEAKER. We are considering the resolution reported by the committee. That is why the Chair got mixed up about it.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to inquire if I may have 15 minutes?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understood the gentleman from North Carolina to say that there is no request for time on this side of the House.

Mr. POUL. I just had a request for 15 minutes.

Mr. SISSON. Would the gentleman's request necessarily consume two hours?

The SPEAKER. Oh, a gentleman can quit whenever he pleases inside of his hour.

Mr. POUL. I am going to use but 15 minutes.

Mr. SISSON. I want to get along with the appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. A man does not have to talk an hour unless he wants to do so.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. To ask the gentleman from North Carolina another question.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. POUL. I do.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I call the attention of the gentleman from North Carolina to the phraseology in lines 6, 7, and 8—

that purport to be organized or engaged in or have been directly or indirectly engaged in the nomination, election—

and so forth. That is not good language, "or engaged in or have been directly or indirectly engaged in the nomination, election," and so forth.

Mr. POUL. I yield to the gentleman to offer any amendment he sees fit.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Well, most certainly it ought to be amended there.

Mr. POUL. I would like to get the time settled. I will yield to the gentleman 5 minutes or 10 minutes, as he desires.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. What is the question?

The SPEAKER. The question is this two hours' limitation.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. One hour on a side, with the previous question to be ordered?

The SPEAKER. Yes; the request is that the gentleman from North Carolina have an hour and the gentleman from Kansas an hour if he wants to use that much of it, and at the end of the two hours, or the end of the debate if it collapses sooner, the previous question is considered as ordered.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will not the gentleman from North Carolina modify the request to do away with the previous question?

Mr. POUL. I am willing to let it be modified, leaving out the previous question being considered as ordered, because I do not want to cut off amendments.

Mr. MANN. That would amount to about the same thing. There would be no debate at the end of the two hours anyhow.

Mr. POUL. I am trying to satisfy gentlemen.

Mr. MANN. Suppose the gentleman asks unanimous consent, pending the two hours' debate, that it shall be in order to offer amendments by anybody who gets the floor.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman amend his request?

Mr. POUL. I will.

The SPEAKER. And that pending this two hours' debate it shall be in order to offer amendments without the gentleman from North Carolina or the gentleman from Kansas either one yielding the floor. Is there objection?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. For a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. At the expiration of the two hours, then, will the resolution be taken up for consideration under the five-minute rule by paragraphs or in its entirety as one motion?

The SPEAKER. Why, it is just like any other resolution. If the previous question is not ordered, it is subject to amendment and debate. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I shall only consume a very few minutes of the time of the House. Most of the Members of the House are familiar with the activities of the National Security League. It appears that this is an organization of the State of New York which has undertaken to pass upon the fitness of Members to sit in this body. But for a few things that have developed in the course of the preliminary investigation the National Security League would not be of sufficient importance to justify an investigation, but it has appeared that a large amount of money was raised and expended by this organization. I believe it is admitted that something over a million dollars was raised by the gentlemen who have charge of this organization. This is a large amount of money. Certain gentlemen who stand high in the esteem of the people of this Nation have lent their names to the organization. Now, this organization has undertaken to prescribe a certain standard by which men must stand or fall as Members of this body.

If they attain to the standard of the organization, they get a clean bill of health. If they fail to reach such standard, the organization goes into the districts of those men to accomplish their defeat if possible. Remembering that the concern has been able to raise more than a million dollars, this fact presents quite a serious question. It matters not how hard a man may work here, how patriotic he may have been, unless he comes up to the standard of this Security League he must go down in defeat. There are some gentlemen who were working for some of the things this organization claims to stand for long before it saw the light of day. Among that number is the Member who is addressing the House at this time. Long years before the National Security League was heard of I was doing what I could to convince the House of Representatives in my humble way that this Nation should maintain a great Navy. I never could see any sense in having a Navy just big enough to be defeated. I wanted a Navy big enough to defeat any other navy in the world. And I stand for that now. I except the navy of no nation. Under Mr. Roosevelt, for once in my life, I stepped out of line with my own party and voted for four battleships, and everything in the world that I could do to strengthen the naval or military power of the Government I have done here, in a humble way though it may be, for 17 years. But because I did not vote for three or four amendments to great measures this National Security League, so I am told, rates me as 50 per cent patriotic. I have been standing here all these years doing what I could, ready to give my all to my country, my two boys, the only boys I have, volunteering, and one of them sleeping beneath the sod of France; and yet I must be recorded as 50 per cent patriotic. I spit in the

face of a man who impugns my patriotism or my loyalty. [Applause.]

It is no light matter, gentlemen of the House of Representatives, in an hour like this, to have a man's patriotism or his loyalty to his country impugned. I will not say loyalty, because if I am not patriotic I am nothing. I do not want any man to call me loyal. Loyalty keeps me out of jail. Patriotism is my love for my country and my flag, a love that is willing to give all, life itself, if necessary.

I say this would not have been such a serious matter if it had not been for the powerful names behind this organization and the great amount of money they have been able to raise. Now, I say this, so far as these gentlemen are concerned who constitute this National Security League, if they go before the American people with clean hands they need not fear an investigation. [Applause.] If their motives are clean, if their purposes are patriotic they should welcome an investigation. They should have no objection to it. On the other hand, if there is a sinister purpose behind this organization, if it shall develop in this investigation that some man is using this organization to start a propaganda here for a selfish purpose, then the people of America are entitled to have this investigation in order that the whole truth may come out. So I say, Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules was justified in reporting this resolution.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman yield for a question for information?

Mr. POUL. I will.

Mr. WHEELER. Does this National Security League recommend the defeat of any Member of Congress or the election of any Member that the gentleman knows of? That is just a matter of inquiry.

Mr. POUL. My information is that it recommended the defeat of all Members who did not come up to their standard of parliamentary excellence.

Mr. FREAR. Will the gentleman yield? I have plenty of information of specific cases where they recommended the defeat of different candidates.

Mr. POUL. And they actually undertook to appraise the fitness of Members to sit in this body. I say it would be laughable but for the great names and the great amount of money behind this thing. Ordinarily it would be a joke for any set of men to arrogate to themselves the power to pass upon the fitness of all candidates for the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, Members of this body have differed and always will differ, but there is no dividing line when the patriotism of men who sit in this Chamber is considered. [Applause.] As a rule we have all stood shoulder to shoulder in supporting the administration in this war, in doing all that could be done to prosecute the war to a successful conclusion. [Applause.]

Mr. PLATT. Is it not true that a whole lot of other organizations do exactly the same thing, like the Anti-Saloon League, and so forth, in seeking to influence elections to Congress?

Mr. POUL. So far as I am advised and informed, I hardly think the gentleman will be able to find an exact parallel to the activities of this particular organization.

Now, I conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying that I believe that this resolution is justified. I think the House of Representatives ought to pass it and order this investigation. If the purposes of this organization are clean, then no one of its members can object to an investigation. If they are unclean, then the world ought to know it. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, this resolution raises a very important question in connection with the law that we have placed upon our statutes with respect to activities of committees in campaigns. If this National Security League can participate in a campaign as it participated in the last campaign, without let or hindrance, other organizations for other purposes can take a like active part. For instance, the Anti-Saloon League could come out in the open as this organization came out in the open. The Protective Tariff League could come out in the open as this came out in the open. A free-trade league could come out into the open as this came out in the open, without publishing the names of contributors or filing the expenses that they have been to in the conduct of a campaign for or against Members. Either we should repeal the law that prohibits political committees from activity in the election or defeat of Members of Congress altogether or we should see to it that no exception is made, not even of a committee with the high-sounding name borne by the National Security League. In addition to what has been stated by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU], no committee, however organized or of whatever political proclivity, has ever indulged in the slimy politics that was indulged in by this organization. [Applause.] It resorted through the publicity it

had in the newspapers to the grossest misrepresentation as to facts.

It magnified trivial amendments into matters of the greatest possible importance. It took an amendment of a few lines in a bill of 30 pages, an amendment which of itself only added to the purpose of the bill or resolution and made it appear that Members of Congress were opposed to every line in the bill or resolution of thirty-odd pages because they voted for an amendment of three or four lines which really perfected and made effective the bill or resolution itself.

Let me illustrate a misrepresentation. The McLemore resolution was magnified into a war measure by this organization. The McLemore resolution followed a policy of the administration. On the 18th of January, 1916, long, long before we were in the war or dreamed of going into it, the administration, through the Secretary of State, published to the world that the armed merchantmen of belligerent nations should be considered as armed cruisers, and therefore nations were notified that our Government was contemplating denying those ships clearance from our ports. This was on the 18th day of January, 1916. The gentleman from Texas, Mr. McLEMORE, introduced his resolution in February, 1916, to give effect to the administration's purposes. Something happened. There was a change in the attitude of the administration. I am not questioning the purpose of the change; I am simply stating the effect of it. The administration opposed what it had favored some five weeks before, and on the 7th day of March, when the McLemore resolution was under consideration, Members of this House on both sides voted for the conception they had of an armed cruiser on the 18th day of January, as they secured it from the Secretary of State. The American people went through a political campaign months after that. The result of that campaign was the election of a candidate for the Presidency upon a peace platform. And yet the National Security League made men in your district and in mine believe that if you voted not to lay the McLemore resolution on the table you voted for the resolution while our country was engaged in war or after a declaration of war had been made.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Certainly.

Mr. FREAR. The gentleman means voted for tabling, not for the resolution?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes; but the league did not say that men voted to table the resolution or against tabling it. It said that men voted for the resolution, and the impression that people in the country had was that Members of this House voted for the McLemore resolution. Not a Member of this House voted for the McLemore resolution. It is doubtful if a dozen Members on this floor would have voted for the McLemore resolution without amendment. Every man who had convictions upon the subject involved at all would have voted for a concrete proposition of three or four lines on the subject, declaring the purpose of the Government of the United States to advise its citizens not as to what their rights were but as to what they should do as a matter of wisdom under the circumstances, and not take passage on the armed cruisers of any of the countries at war.

So much for the McLemore resolution. Now, upon another question: It was stated throughout the country, in every congressional district, that certain Members of Congress voted against the draft law. There is not a Member of this House who voted against the draft law. The National Security League published a falsehood. It said that every man who voted against the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. KINN] to strike out of the Army bill that provision that provided for 500,000 volunteers in six months and 500,000 more after another six months voted against conscription, which is a falsehood in cold type. [Applause.]

No man, I say, voted against conscription or the draft. The Army bill provided three ways of raising an army. First of all was the draft; second was the filling up the quotas of the Regulars and State troops; third, 500,000 volunteers in six months and 500,000 in a year if in the discretion of the President they were needed. That was the report of the Committee on Military Affairs. That was the bill that Members came upon this floor ready to support on both sides. The gentleman from California moved to strike out the provision for volunteers. Many of us believed in the volunteer—in the right of the boys to volunteer. We did not want to strike that out of the bill. It was falsely published all over the United States that the Speaker of this House made a bitter attack on conscription. He made a valiant and forceful speech on the right of men to volunteer. [Applause.] In the argument that ensued upon the motion of the gentleman from California there was a heated debate on the relative merits of conscription and volunteers. It naturally arose. But there was no question at

any time upon this floor about raising an army by conscription for the prosecution of this war, and the National Security League knew that when it published all over this country the falsehood that Members voted against the draft law. I repeat that not a Member of this House voted against the draft law except such Members as voted against the Army bill altogether. Any Member who voted for the Army bill voted for the draft law.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman is correct in that last statement. There were 390 or more that voted for the bill which contained the conscription provision, and a few more than 20 who voted against it. Will the gentleman permit me to add a word right there?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I saw in my district repeated statements in newspapers denouncing our distinguished Speaker and the distinguished minority leader of the House by name as having voted against conscription. I corrected that statement at least half a dozen times in speeches, and yet the same statements were afterwards repeated over and over again, notwithstanding I exhibited the Record to show the falsehood of the statements.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman meant the majority leader of the House as having been mentioned by name.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes; I meant the majority leader—Mr. KITCHIN.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. In the last three days of the campaign, in order to emphasize anything it might have overlooked, the National Security League republished and sent out as a fresh reminder to every country weekly of every political faith a restatement of the falsehoods that I have indicated with respect to the votes of Members, and what I have said about the McLenore resolution and the draft law is equally true about every other proposition that it published. It was a film of falsehood and misrepresentation, of half-truths throughout. Why, a political organization found in any ward or precinct in any city in this country that indulged in that kind of politics would be anathematized by all respectable people in the community. I am amazed that the respectable gentlemen whose names appear in connection with this organization have permitted its activities along the lines upon which it participated in this campaign.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit me an interruption?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. The gentleman from Alabama has kindly brought here the Record of April 28, 1917. Page 1557 of the Record shows that on the final vote on the Army bill, which then contained the clause providing for conscription, there were 397 yeas and 24 nays, just as the gentleman has said.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I am glad to have the confirmation of the Record.

Mr. PLATT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. For a question.

Mr. PLATT. Does the gentleman mean to say that the fight on the Kahn motion was not distinctly a fight over conscription?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. I mean to say that it was a fight against the right of men to volunteer.

Mr. PLATT. It was a fight against conscription.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The clause for conscription was read. Not a word was said; not a motion was made. The clause was agreed to without a single objection. The next clause was read, providing for filling up the quotas of the National and State troops, and not a motion was made; not a word was said. That was agreed to. Both those propositions were agreed to without debate. The next clause was read, providing for volunteers. Then the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] moved to strike that out of the bill, and it was upon that motion that the debate arose. It was upon that motion that the votes were had.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. RUCKER. The particular language which the gentleman from California moved to strike out, and which was stricken out, expressly provided that nothing herein—that is, in the language stricken out—shall in any wise delay or interfere with conscription or the enforcement of the draft. It was not intended to interfere with the conscription.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. The intention of the Kahn motion was to prevent men from volunteering. That was the intention of the motion. That was the effect of the motion.

Mr. RUCKER. And the intent of those who voted against the motion was to let men volunteer if they wanted to?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Why, certainly; and there never was any other intention. As to whether or not we could have raised an army more quickly by permitting a million volunteers than by waiting for more than six months before a single man was in uniform under the draft, that question is past; but the question is now fresh in the minds of the country that this great organization, the American Security League, misrepresented before the American people matters of great importance in a legislative way, affecting the rights of Members of Congress.

Mr. ANTHONY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. It is interesting to note that the War Department raised about a million volunteers, however, by the very same plan that was stricken out of the bill.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. They did that under the provision for filling the quotas of the Regulars and the State troops.

Mr. ANTHONY. They did that of their own volition afterwards, recognizing the fact that the judgment of the Committee on Military Affairs was correct in the first place, and it was subsequently indorsed by the War Department.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Every congressional district represented here furnished volunteers, but the volunteer provision was stricken out of the bill for some reason, and men who voted to retain it in the bill were branded all over the country as disloyal, unfit for places in this House, by this great organization—great not because of its activities but because of the names that it bears upon its roster, but infamous because of the amount of money it was able to raise by its false misrepresentations as to its purposes and the necessity for its existence.

This resolution should be agreed to, and an investigation of the activities of this organization should be made. It should be ascertained as to whether or not it has complied with the laws relative to elections in the United States; and if not, steps should be taken such as are proper with respect to political organizations that have not complied with the law.

I reserve the remainder of my time. Will the gentleman from North Carolina use some now?

Mr. POU. There are no requests for time on this side.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Then I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RODENBERG].

Mr. RODENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to take up the time of the House any further than to say that I am very heartily in favor of the adoption of this resolution. The fact is that the loyalty of fully 90 per cent of the membership of this House has been challenged by this organization known as the National Security League, with headquarters in the city of New York. The widest possible publicity was given to these sensational charges of disloyalty. Billboards were utilized, street-car advertising was employed, newspaper space was hired, literature was sent broadcast throughout the country; in fact, nothing was left undone to discredit Members of Congress who voted on various bills and whose votes did not conform to the peculiar standards of patriotism set up by this league of self-constituted censors. It is also well known that in many instances the records of Members of Congress were deliberately falsified and their votes intentionally misrepresented. It was stated before our committee by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] that the league, according to its own admission, spent the enormous sum of \$1,200,000 in this reprehensible effort to place a stigma upon the character and the reputation of the great majority of the Members of this House. One million two hundred thousand dollars is a pretty large sum of money, even at this time, when we are accustomed to talking in billions. I think it is most important that we should know where this money came from. We are entitled to know who it was that financed this campaign of vilification and misrepresentation. The country is entitled to know whether the men who contributed to this enormous fund were influenced solely by patriotic motives or whether they did not after all have some ulterior purpose to serve. An investigation of this kind will uncover the truth. It will reveal the real motives back of this attack upon the Americanism of the membership of this House. I believe that Congress owes it to itself, to its own dignity, to its own sense of self-respect, to order a full and searching investigation into all the activities of the National Security League, its auxiliaries, and the influences back of them.

Now that the question is up, if we should fail to take this action, every sneering critic of Congress in the country will at once construe it as an admission on our part of the truthfulness of the charges, and I undertake to say that the National Security League would be among the very first to assert that when given an opportunity the American Congress did not have

the courage to order an investigation of charges reflecting upon the honor, the integrity, and the Americanism of its membership.

For these reasons I am in favor of the adoption of the resolution. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR.]

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to discuss the resolution nor to delay its passage for a moment. I have discussed the Security League on two different occasions—on September 23 and on December 4—when I placed before the House fully the character of this organization which you are called upon to investigate. There is nothing need be added to that. I have made a prima facie case; and, further than that, the Rules Committee, without argument, has unanimously reported the resolution. I have a different purpose, of which I will speak.

First, I wish to read two letters which I received in this morning's mail, among four I hold all to the same purpose. One is from a leading lawyer, I apprehend, in New Jersey, in which he says, under date of December 6, 1918:

You are on the right side of this matter. I became a member of this league in its inception, whose purposes I approved of. However, I have watched the course pursued by the very able gentlemen who are really the Security League and have become convinced that it is a sinister organization as now officered and conducted.

You will find, if you succeed in getting an investigation of it, that you will meet with the plaudits of a vast number of thinking people in this country, in fact a large majority of the people who know anything of the scope and purposes of the activities of this league during the last campaign.

Now, let me read a brief extract from a letter from Boston. It is under a printed letterhead, and I assume from its tone that the writer is reliable. He writes—

Nothing that has happened in Congress for a long time has given so much real satisfaction and positive joy as has your attack on the National Security League. I joined the league in 1915 supposing it to be just what it purported to be, an organization to further reasonable preparedness for war.

The last paragraph is as follows:

Feeling as I do, I shall naturally follow the course of your investigation with intense interest. I hope very earnestly that such a gang of irresponsible, hypocritical tyrants may be thoroughly shown up as they deserve and their organization collapse.

I have another letter from Chicago and another from Ohio along the same lines, apart from many others received heretofore. Gentlemen who were members of the organization were misled as to the general purpose.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to discuss the league further. As I have said, the Rules Committee has reported this resolution unanimously. You do not want to mistake the character of the proposition you are up against. These gentlemen are able, they hold great power that can be exercised, because there are many propositions involved in such an investigation, and all influences will be brought to bear.

Over a dozen years ago, if you will permit a personal allusion, in my own State I drew a resolution as vigorously as I could draft it attacking irregularities in the insurance companies of this country. I knew what they had been doing. That was before the Armstrong investigation was actually begun and the resolution was based largely on the Lawson statements. In Wisconsin the legislature created a committee with full power to investigate and I was elected chairman of that investigation. We spent 130-odd days in investigation, and spent over \$40,000. It was the basis of insurance legislation in Wisconsin, and I am sure it was of value because I never heard criticism of that investigation, although it was very expensive and of the longest duration of anything ever held of that kind.

Before we undertook the investigation I went to one of the ablest examiners in the United States, as he is conceded to be, and I said to him, "Mr. Hughes, tell me what we can do in this matter to get at the bottom of the case." We wanted to employ him. He said in reply by way of illustration that for two days in one case he was cross-examining an insurance witness, and he was about to drop the witness when it turned out that the witness mentioned something which completed a most important link in the evidence connecting up the yellow-dog fund and its contribution to the campaign of a Republican candidate and other illegal use of funds. Remember that there were powerful influences brought to bear on that committee, and frequently its members were not in sympathy with Mr. Hughes, but it was forced upon them by his fearless probe.

I could mention other things which I do not care to repeat now to show the necessity of a strong, thorough cross-examination by this committee. Why do I do this? Personally I would rather be relieved of any further connection with this work which I have undertaken simply because it is prosecuted for the House and for the good name of the House and in no way is a personal matter. Let me say that whether I care or not, it

is fair to assume that I will not be on the committee, and I shall not be.

Possibly I am too aggressive, but we will never get anywhere with this investigation unless we go to the bottom of it. Who are the men that challenge attention at this time? Who are the league's officers that have falsely traduced this body? What is their purpose? They say that they want compulsory military training. That is one purpose, irrespective of terms of peace. This junker organization that wants to force militarism upon us has other interests to further as well. I would like to show you the far-reaching influence of some of its officers, where they go and how far they go, in Mexico and elsewhere—these men who have been writing you and demanding that you respond within 10 days as to your position on public questions. There are other great influences that will be brought to bear here. The organization for the return of the railroads, headed by Mr. Root, can not be ignored, and their influence may be more powerful than we realize. I am satisfied that any committee selected here will do the best it can, and that those who are selected are sure to exercise the best judgment they have, but the responsibility is great.

That committee must do the work. You have provided no lawyers by this resolution; you have Hughes; you have no one excepting yourselves; and you have got to go down into this probe and keep at it for many days. It means work. I have worked many days in developing what I have presented to you, and I know what it means. It has not really started yet. I do not want to go on the committee, and I thank the gentlemen who have anticipated my preference. A number of my friends have said to me that they want me on the committee, but I have said frankly just how I feel in the matter.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. In a moment. It has been suggested I might be a prosecutor. That is impossible, for it is not my matter any more than it is yours. I would not go upon the committee in that rôle nor in the rôle of clerk of the committee. The gentlemen who are appointed on the committee can do these things and they can get good results through hard work, but they will have great opposition interests to meet.

Mr. KING. I want to say that I think it would be a misfortune to this House if the gentleman did not go on the committee.

Mr. FREAR. I thank the gentleman for his suggestion, and I do not impugn any of the motives of those who have doubted the wisdom of my being there. They think that I am too aggressive. That may be true, but you can not fight the Kaiser and his legions with a corporal's guard of pacifists. Nor can you meet this crowd of influential slanderers with kid gloves. You have got to go after these men who have been charging you with disloyalty. Will you accept that insult? You would knock a man down who would say that to you personally, would you not? Then why treat these public slanderers with gentle hands? You must act in the same rôle as a prosecuting officer. What is his purpose? He is supposed to have a judicial function, but he prosecutes to the limit to get the facts. And that is exactly what must be done here to ascertain the facts and present them to the House. The House itself is the one that will pass on the facts and will determine what shall be done, what judgment shall be imposed, but the committee must go to the bottom in its probe. If it does not it will carry to the country a wrong impression of these charges of disloyalty against the House and what they mean. Some Members suggest that this league should be brought to book because it has failed to make its report to the Clerk of the House. What a superficial suggestion! A thousand dollars fine for an organization engaged in spending a million dollars a year! That is not the point at all. We must bring these men here and say: "You charge this House with disloyalty. Why do you do it? What is behind that charge? Is it universal military training, is it junkerdom, or what is the motive for this campaign of falsehood and libel?"

Mr. Speaker, I believe it goes further than that. Is it the contribution of munition makers? I believe it is greater than that. Gentlemen will remember when I began my fight against certain legislation in the House. It was a very disagreeable thing to undertake, but I did it for the sake of better legislative standards. That was my motive entirely when I attacked the Rivers and Harbors Committee and the public-hearings bill. I met with discouragement and slurs from men I thought ought to have given me encouragement. My hope was for better legislation. Whether I succeeded to any degree or not you know. That has been my only purpose in making those fights, and so I say to you, gentlemen, that whatever may be the results, whoever may be appointed on this committee, I hope you will go on and make a thorough probe and

ascertain those who are the responsible parties. Do not for a moment ignore the fact that the interests you are probing will bring every effort to cover up their tracks to discredit your work.

Let me say, in conclusion, to my mind this is the most important investigation that this House has undertaken for years. It means much for the integrity of the House and the integrity of the individual Members and the honor of the House, as my good friend from Illinois [Mr. RODENBERG] said, more than anything else I can think of. Those who treat it lightly have strange standards of right and wrong and of public responsibility.

I wish to speak now a word to the committee, of which I shall not be a member. Do not fail in this investigation. Go to the bottom of it. It is your duty to work to the limit, because it requires work to accomplish things. I have made a prima facie case. I can do more than that with the data collected, but much of it has to be dug out on cross-examination, the same as in every other successful probe, and it must be done in this case. Do not permit it to fail. I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT].

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Speaker, I did not know that it was lese majeste to criticize the vote of a Member of the House of Representatives, but, according to this resolution, doubtless it is. Any body of men or any individual who dares to criticize a Member of this House for voting in a certain way must be investigated and cross-examined and put on the grill and have his motives questioned, and if possible you must find out that he is connected with some munition factory or something of the kind. The purpose of this resolution seems to be to try to make out a sinister motive back of the National Security League. If you are going to investigate the National Security League, or if you ought to investigate it, then you ought to investigate all of the other numerous organizations which are doing the same thing. The Anti-Saloon League seeks to influence the election of Members of Congress, and everybody knows their literature is sent broadcast, and they are spending large sums of money. The Woman Suffrage Association seeks to influence the election of Members of Congress. The labor unions and many other organizations do the same thing to some extent.

Mr. RANDALL. Has the Anti-Saloon League accused anyone of being disloyal?

Mr. PLATT. I do not know that it has. I am not quite sure about that, but the German-American Alliance sought to influence Members of Congress and their election. They got out a circular against me in 1916, which I have proudly framed on the walls of my office at this time.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLATT. What do we want to do? We ought to go into a general investigation of all these organizations if we are of one.

Mr. GORDON. The German-American Alliance contributed a large amount of money to the Republican State campaign in New York in 1916, just the same, and supported the Republican Party.

Mr. PLATT. The German-American Alliance attacked the Republican Members of Congress in 1916, and I never heard of it contributing any money to campaign funds, unless to Democratic funds.

It seems to me that every man who votes for this resolution votes himself a sorehead. I do not believe we can afford to do that. There are men in this House who are members of the National Security League. Why do you not ask what their motives are? They contribute a dollar a year to this organization, which is used to circulate literature. It has not accused anyone of being disloyal. That is a figment of the imagination of the men criticized. They have felt that they were wrong, but as to being called disloyal, the National Security League, so far as I know, has not used the word "disloyal," though doubtless some of the newspapers have in the heat of the campaign.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. PLATT. I do not yield to the gentleman from Ohio just now. I want to repeat that the objects of this organization are perfectly plain, as are the motives of similar organizations like the Navy League. Doubtless they are in favor of universal military service, but there is no object in investigating them to find out anything. The purpose of this proposed investigation is not to find out anything but to get back at somebody. I do not believe this House of Representatives can afford to lower its dignity to the position of trying to get back at somebody because the votes of some individual Members have been criticized.

Mr. GORDON. Before the gentleman takes his seat, does he think they raised—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Speaker, I did not consume all of my time, because I imagined what was going to follow. I am always interested in objections that this House will stultify itself by having an investigation of those who assail its integrity. I should imagine, if I were a member of the 47 who had voted against the first revenue bill passed to carry on the war, or if I had voted against the amendment for the income-tax increases on \$20,000 incomes, if I had the record which is carried by some gentlemen on this floor on opposing financial sinews to carry on the war, I might feel the same as the distinguished gentleman who just addressed you. That is his record. [Applause.] He voted wrong, but the Security League excepted 47 perfect Members. Why did not the league think of including these tests in its list? On the question of amendment, proposed by Senator LENROO, for partial conscription of wealth, he was against it. Why did not the league have that vote included as one of the acid tests? [Applause.] The gentleman objects to the resolution, and he ventures to criticize the House. He ought not to criticize the House because we want to find out what is behind all this—

Mr. PLATT. I criticize the House for being thin-skinned. It seems to me that men in politics ought to be able to take a hit once in a while.

Mr. FREAR. But if a man said that I was disloyal I would knock the man down—that is how thin-skinned I am. I will not permit any organization of this kind for a moment to get it into their heads they can declare the House disloyal without being held to answer such charges.

Mr. GORDON. Does the gentleman think the National Security League raised \$1,200,000 to spend in this campaign by \$1 subscriptions?

Mr. FREAR. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio we do not say they spent that amount in this campaign, but I do know this, that any organization that spent \$1,200,000 annually, as they admit, could well afford to pay \$1,000 fine under the corrupt-practice act, an act which we all know you can drive a horse and wagon through. We want to know who put up the money. What we are after also is to vindicate the good name of the House and of Congress, not only on this side of the aisle but on the other side. I have been asked about the eight acid tests. You will find them in the speech of December 4. Go behind the returns and find out who these league gentlemen are and what their motives are. I do not think 90 per cent of this House or 90 per cent of the country outside the league of the city of New York will accept, without resentment, charges of disloyalty. I have given you in letters just read to the House the names of men who belong to this association who now repudiate it. They are fully as high-class, I dare say, as the majority of the men who object to this investigation. Go into this investigation, and go into it fully. I will give everything I have, and I have letters in which they charge Representatives here by name as being on the disloyal list, and they ask the people of their States to disgrace and repudiate them. But, gentlemen, if you have it in your mind to raise the standard of the House and resent in this House constant insinuations against the character of the House and against the morale of the House, against the charge of being cheap politicians—if we are willing to resent insults of this kind, here is the chance, and it is your important duty to act now.

Mr. CROSSER. There is something even more important than vindicating the good name of the House. Is it not a matter of duty that the motives of these people be shown up?

Mr. FREAR. It is. The gentleman from Ohio well states a fact. All such motives should be disclosed, and it is of great importance that we keep up the standard of respectability and integrity of the House. The people expect it, and they want to know if we are performing our duty here for the honor of the people and the welfare of the country. Gentlemen, I thank you. [Applause.]

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York, Maj. LA GUARDIA. [Applause.]

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as New York City was dragged into this, I want to say as a Representative of New York City that I never heard of the National Security League until a very short time ago. In 1915, I gather from what the gentleman from Wisconsin said the other day, the National Security League came into existence. Well, at that time I was busy learning to fly at Mineola, and during the last 18 months, of course, my activities took me into other parts of the world, but

I do not believe that this is a matter concerning New York City. I believe anyone has the right to criticize or differ from the views of a Member of Congress. There is no doubt about that. If we are wrong, we expect to hear about it, or if we vote or act in such a way as to differ from the views of others we are bound to be criticized.

But from what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] says, there has been a charge of disloyalty. I am sure there is no man who would charge me with disloyalty and get away with it. [Applause.] And I resent a similar attack upon any gentleman of this body, of which I consider it a great honor to be a Member. I disagree in everything in the world with my distinguished colleague from Ohio [Mr. GORDON], but I would resent an attack on his loyalty as much as I would an attack on mine. [Applause.]

Now, the resolution, as I understand it, calls for an investigation, and until we have the facts before us we are not going to pass upon the guilt or innocence of this particular organization. But it seems to me that if its motives are really patriotic, if they had no other interest but that of securing a Congress which would act according to their views, they should welcome this investigation. We will arrive at a sad time if a Member of Congress may be called disloyal because he happens to vote the other way. That being the case, and knowing very little about this organization, but with the prima facie case presented by the gentleman from Wisconsin, I shall vote for the resolution, because I want the facts. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and then I will yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER] to offer his amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I suppose that there is practically no opposition to the passage of this resolution. I never have been very much in favor of investigating committees or investigations by congressional committees and am not enthusiastic about this. I have been lied about so often concerning so many different things that possibly I am unduly callous to the false statements made concerning me.

Now, I do not know whether the National Security League favored or opposed my nomination or election in the last campaign. I do not care. I do not know whether they furnished the information which a very nice young gentleman gave to the public who was running against me in my district, every line of which was a falsehood, but I think he got his information from the Democratic congressional committee. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] And if we are going to investigate all the falsehoods published concerning us, I would commence with the Democratic congressional committee [laughter and applause], because I think—

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. MANN (continuing). Because I think they can publish more false statements about Republican candidates than the National Security League could imagine.

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. Certainly.

Mr. HARDY. Does not the gentleman think they would have a hard time publishing as many false statements about Republicans as the Republican congressional committee can publish about Democrats?

Mr. MANN. I do not know. I take it that the Democrats would start in with an investigation of the Republican congressional committee; but the trouble is that the Republican congressional committee never has had as vivid an imagination as the Democratic members of the Democratic congressional committee, and most of the statements made by the Democratic congressional committee are based on vivid imagination. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARDY. Does not the gentleman think that is a pretty vivid statement he is making right now? [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. No; that is a statement of pure fact.

Mr. HARDY. That nobody else would agree to.

Mr. MANN. If I thought the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY] would agree to any statement I made, I would think I was in error. [Laughter.]

Mr. HARDY. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. MANN. Oh, no.

Mr. HARDY. All right.

Mr. MANN. Of course in this House there were at times heated intimations from some Member of the House in debate that some other Member of the House in debate had not been really loyal and patriotic. Well, those things occur sometimes in debate. Of course no one can expect that an entire body will always vote the same way. If it shall ever come that upon most of the questions that come before this body all of

the Members agree, it will be a sorry day for the Republic. There should be a difference of opinion in order to ascertain the truth. But in a service of some years in this House I have come to believe firmly in the real earnestness of purpose, devotion to the right, and the unflagging and unfailing loyalty and patriotism of the entire membership of Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH].

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to say anything upon the resolution, but I regard this as a serious and not a frivolous matter. To question, directly or indirectly, the loyalty of Congress in time of war is a most serious matter and should be so regarded not alone by Members themselves but by the entire country. It is not a question of whether or not there were differences of opinion among Members of this House in regard to measures on war or preparedness that came before the House. It is not a question of whether or not we differed as to the policies to be decided upon in the entering and in carrying on of the war. It is a question as to whether or not the votes of Members were misrepresented and wrong conclusions drawn, and if so, by whom and for what purpose, and whether or not men who assume to be responsible are to be permitted to misrepresent, vilify, lie about, and slander the Members of this House and not be called to account. [Applause.]

Now, unless I have the facts wrong, and if the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] or anyone else can show that I have the facts wrong in regard to this league, I will vote against this resolution. Unless I have the facts wrong, the National Security League drew conclusions in regard to the loyalty of the Members of this House upon misstatements of fact. The National Security League not only drew wrong conclusions from statements of fact, which is, to say the least, unfair, but they misstated and misrepresented facts and drew conclusions, using such misstatements as a basis, which could only have the effect of holding the Congress of the United States up to public contempt. Simply because men differ as to policy or mode of procedure does not justify an accusation of disloyalty, either directly or indirectly. So that if this league had told the truth and then charged disloyalty its conduct would have been, to say the least, reprehensible; but to misrepresent the facts and on such a false basis to charge disloyalty merits prompt and vigorous action. No Member of this House should object to honest criticism; he should expect that, but the mouth of the slanderer should be closed.

Those who would criticize Congress or its Members should be required to tell the truth. Men can not slander the Executive nor the Supreme Court without corresponding responsibility. The Senate will not stand for it, and why should the House?

I do not believe I can be included in any such class as the gentleman from New York [Mr. PLATT] referred to, because this league made a bitter fight against me in my district and I increased my majority 5,000 over two years ago. I won in 1914 by 7,000 votes, and against the attacks of the National Security League in 1918 I won by 12,200. But I am deeply interested in one important thing, and that is that the honor and the dignity of this great body should be upheld. The greatest compensation that comes of being a Member of Congress is the honor. It is an honored place. To have been a Member of Congress is something to which your posterity can point to with pride in years to come. If it were a dishonor and a disgrace to be a Member of this House none of us would want to remain here. It is a great honor and should be so regarded. Now, then, the loyalty of 90 per cent of the membership of this House has been challenged in time of war. Are you going to sit idly by and allow them to get away with it? It is not a frivolous matter, and I challenge the inference of the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. It is a serious matter, and I for one desire that this investigation shall go to the bottom of it all, and no matter how high up the men are, no matter how high the places they hold, they should be required to assume the responsibility of their false statements. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time and the floor to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I shall offer this amendment: In line 4, page 1, after the syllable "port," at the beginning of the line, insert the words "and names of contributors."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. And on line 6—

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman finished reading his amendment?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes. I want to offer another one.

The SPEAKER. You had better finish this one first. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend page 1, line 4, after the syllable "port," at the beginning of the line, by inserting the words "and names of contributors."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Now the gentleman will submit the next amendment.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Then, in line 6, if the word "any" is to be used there, the letter "s" should be stricken off the word "organizations." It should read "any associated organization." I move to strike out the letter "s."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman offer that as an amendment? Does he merely purpose to investigate one associated organization or other organizations?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. It should be in the singular—"organization"—if you use the word "any," or else it should be "all organizations." If the amendment is adopted, and the language "any organization" used, then you can investigate a dozen if you choose.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment to change the word "organizations" to the word "organization."

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I do not think the gentleman should do that. I think it means expressly what it says. I think it is now expressed in better language.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, if we wish to be accurate it should be "any organization." Then it would include all organizations. By using "any organization" you could investigate one after another, as many as you might wish.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. GARD. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio demands a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 27, noes 25.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman in charge of the resolution if it would not be better to strike out the word "associated," in line 6, and in lieu thereof insert the word "similar"? There may be State organizations that might contribute great amounts of money in secret.

Mr. FREAR. I would be willing to accept it, of course, if the committee is willing. That is along the line of the original resolution.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Why would it not be better, in place of the word "associated," in line 6, to insert the word "similar"?

Mr. POU. I have no objection.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina accepts the suggestion. I move further to strike out the word "associated" and insert the word "similar."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the gentleman's amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend page 1, line 6, by striking out the word "associated" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "similar."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I do not know very much about the resolution. I thought it might be better for the committee to centralize the spotlight upon this organization rather than to scatter it over a number of organizations. There are a great many. Does the gentleman think it is desirable to have this committee, in the next two months, scatter its jurisdiction. Instead of concentrating on this one organization?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I made the suggestion solely because of what my colleague [Mr. STAFFORD] said about the activities of a certain organization in our State. It might be very difficult to prove that that organization was "associated" in any way with the National Security League. However, in order to concentrate attention upon this National Security League, I will withdraw the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws his amendment.

Mr. CROSSER. I renew it. I offer the amendment myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has not the floor.

Mr. CROSSER. I will obtain the floor later.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I myself do not believe that there are many organizations which can properly be characterized as "similar" to the National Security League. I know of very few corporate bodies that engage in politics as that corporation did. I know some associations—you might call them societies—which do that, but I know of very few corporations that engage in politics after the manner of the National Security League. But perhaps the resolution is better just as it is.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] to offer an amendment.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment after the word "officers," in line 3, to add the words "agents and employees."

I am of the opinion that many members of this organization may have no knowledge, while some of its agents and employees, many of them professional lobbyists, organizing this and other similar organizations for the purpose of securing employment and large pay for their services, have endeavored to dictate the policies of the Congress of the United States. For that reason I am of the opinion that we should add these words, reaching these professional lobbyists and patriots for pay.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SABATH: Page 1, line 3, after the word "officers" insert the words "agents and employees."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the word "associated," in line 6, and insert the word "similar."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CROSSER: Page 1, line 6, strike out the word "associated" and insert in lieu thereof the word "similar."

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, this is an important amendment. I venture to say before any investigation is begun that it will be found that most of the activity of the kind described by Members who favor this resolution has been carried on by organizations having other names than the National Security League. Every local gang who were interested in the defeat of a man to whom they were opposed because, perhaps, of his economic views, formed some organization or another for the purpose of carrying on their opposition. If, therefore, we are really to investigate, if we desire to turn the limelight on the hypocrisy of such individuals, then, I say, let us investigate these other "groups" as well as the National Security League.

This is a much more important matter than some would try to have us believe. The filth that such organizations spread broadcast was not merely the expression of a difference of opinion. One can not object to criticism from a man if he makes his criticism in a fair, manly way; but this organization and others of its ilk have gone much further than that. They have undertaken deliberately to ruin men's reputations. They have undertaken to destroy all that is worth while in life, the good name that men may have won after long, arduous years of toil and self-abnegation. I say that if we are going to allow that sort of thing to go on without exposure, then we care very little about the future of the country.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The word "similar" will not carry out the intention of the gentleman.

Mr. CROSSER. Yes; it will.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Because they will question the jurisdiction of the committee, and you will have to prove first that the organization is similar.

Mr. CROSSER. That will be a matter for the decision of the committee, and if they are favorable to the purposes of this resolution they will not have any trouble in discovering the similarity.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman will find that it will not help a bit.

Mr. CROSSER. It will help a great deal.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. If you undertake to investigate all these so-called similar organizations, where are you going to begin and where are you going to leave off?

Mr. CROSSER. We will begin with organizations of this character. It will not take very long; and if we are going to consider it a tedious matter to investigate these organizations, it will be found that the investigation of the National Security League may be open to that objection.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The gentleman is interpreting my question in a way that may please him, but it is not my question. I am trying to get at a practical way of doing the thing, if the thing itself is practical. If you are going to investigate every difference of opinion on this subject that may have associated its supporters in an organization on the face of the North American Continent in the United States of America, you will find that the investigation will be in full blast at noon on the 4th of March next.

Mr. CROSSER. The concrete case which I have in mind is that of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR]. I understand that the organization that nominally was opposing him was not the National Security League but the One Hundred Per Cent American League.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. The gentleman is aware that constitutionally our committee could not arraign anybody or correct anybody for mere difference of opinion with us.

Mr. CROSSER. To the extent of letting the public know what these men were doing, what their purposes were, and what they were trying to accomplish, the committee would have authority to compel testimony.

Mr. GREENE of Vermont. However earnest we are about it, we have got to go at this thing in the right way. We must go at this thing to discover what was contrary to law and not upon the mere difference of opinion.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the motion of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FOSTER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought we were to have two hours' general debate.

The SPEAKER. Somehow or other they have agreed to another arrangement.

Mr. MANN. But the two hours have not yet expired.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought the gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from North Carolina controlled the time.

Mr. MANN. But when they sit down and do not control the time, somebody else gets the floor.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, it seems to have been one of the developments of modern political life that questions are discussed largely through the medium of self-appointed committees. My observation has been that these committees, such as we have been discussing here, have their activities as long as their contributions, which they exact from credulous adherents, last, and that a great proportion of the money which they collect is spent for the salaries of the officers, agents, and employees.

However that may be, I do not view with approval the suggestion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CROSSER] that similar organizations to the National Security League should be investigated under the present resolution. Rather do I agree with the gentleman from Illinois, who thinks, as I do, that the very object of this resolution is to concentrate attention and investigation upon the work of this National Security League, because if we are to open up to this committee all the activities of every propaganda organization the labor of the committee appointed by the Speaker will be unending.

There is only one way that we can logically pursue it, and that is if there is evidence established before the committee appointed by the Speaker of a particular propaganda, a particular method of conduct in which the wrongful use of money is also of large consequence, that is a matter in which the country is interested and in which the House is interested. But we are not interested in the development of every local committee or of every sort of propaganda, whatever it may be, against an individual Member of this House.

So in discussing this rule and the scope to which the rule should have effect I disagree also with another member of the Ohio delegation who has spoken recently, in which he said that certain truthful things were published and then wrongful deductions were made from it. I do not think there should be any investigation by a committee of the House or anybody else because something truthful was said and improper deductions were made therefrom.

Neither do I think the subsequent statement entirely correct, when the gentleman said that something wrong was published and then wrongful deductions were drawn from that, since that implies a double negative. I think what the House wants to get at is to investigate the National Security League and any influence that sought to control the election of Members of the House wrongfully, if it did so wrongfully. and the scope of the resolution is wide enough to accomplish that purpose.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CROSSER: Page 1, line 6, strike out the word "associated" and insert the word "similar."

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment. After the word "to," in line 3, insert the words "the articles of incorporation," so that they will be required to make report as to the articles of incorporation.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "to," insert the words "the articles of incorporation."

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. GARD. Does not the gentleman think that the purpose of that would be reached under the language of line 4—"general character"?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. I do not think so.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution as amended.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed the following committee: Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky, Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi, Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia, Mr. CARAWAY of Arkansas, Mr. TOWNER of Iowa, Mr. REAVIS of Nebraska, and Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to address the House for three minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. GRAHAM] made a statement in the RECORD that he had obtained information from the Surgeon General's office of the Army that a Mr. Troendle, from Dawson Springs, Ky., representing the Dawson Springs Hotel Co., in June tendered to the Government, or wanted to turn over to the Government, a tract of land and the hotel for the purpose of a hospital. He said that this offer was considered by the Government, and finally the project was rejected by the Surgeon General.

Mr. Speaker, I happened to be down there present at the conversation with Mr. Troendle, who is a constituent of mine. I want to say to the House, first and foremost, that the Dawson Springs Hotel Co. does not own a hotel. They own in fee simple about 1,000 acres of land down there, upon which they proposed to construct a hotel. Bonds were sold before the war was declared and excavation for a \$1,000,000 hotel was already made.

Mr. Troendle did say to Gen. Gorgas in my presence that if they could get the restrictions lifted by the priority division of the War Industries Board, whereby they could get the material, he would complete the hotel and turn it over to the Government as a hospital during the war, but not turn the property over to the Government permanently. That proposition was not considered and rejected; it was not considered, because Gen. Gorgas said, "What we want are buildings now, and by the time the hotel will be completed it would be too late." That had nothing to do with the Dawson Springs hotel. They own no hotel. They expect to construct a hotel, but that has nothing to do with the bill recently passed by the House. The Surgeon General did not investigate Dawson Springs and did not reject it.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINCHELOE. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say that I was present at a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and Col. Smith was interrogated in regard to this and said that there was an offer of property made, but that, so far as his investigation went, there was no rejection of it.

Mr. KINCHELOE. Absolutely no investigation was made.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINCHELOE. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, so far as the information in the Surgeon General's office is concerned, the gentleman will concede, will he not, that the offer was made in June and was not accepted by the Government?

Mr. KINCHELOE. Yes. It was not considered by the Government, because Gen. Gorgas said that they wanted buildings already up, and that by the time this building is constructed it would be too late to use it as a hospital for those in the service.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. If the gentleman will permit the statement, my information in that office was different from what the gentleman has given. I was informed that it was considered but had not been accepted.

Mr. KINCHELOE. I am telling what I know, because I was there at the time of the conversation.

NATIONAL SECURITY LEAGUE—RESIGNATION FROM INVESTIGATING COMMITTEE.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, I have been named by the Speaker, I am informed, as a member of the investigating committee to investigate the National Security League.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, I must respectfully decline to serve upon the committee, thanking the Chair for the compliment paid me by the appointment. Events of a personal nature have recently occurred in my family which make me feel that I can not at this time serve on the committee, and I am therefore compelled to decline.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will fill the vacancy presently.

THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE JOHN A. STERLING.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I present a request for unanimous consent, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON asks unanimous consent that Sunday, January 19, 1919, be set apart for addresses on the life, character, and public services of the Hon. JOHN A. STERLING, late a Representative from Illinois.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 13277, the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the District appropriation bill, with Mr. GARNER in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to correct a clerical error. On page 4, line 6, appears the word "draftmen." That should be "draftsman," and I ask that it be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the correction will be made in accordance with the statement of the gentleman from Mississippi.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Assistant director of primary instruction, \$1,400: *Provided*, That the assistant director of primary instruction now in the service of the public schools, or hereafter to be appointed, shall be placed at the basic salary of \$1,400 per annum, and shall be entitled to an increase of \$50 per annum for five years.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. At this point in the bill last year appeared an item for the rent of offices for the recorder of deeds, \$5,000. What has become of that item? Have quarters been provided in the new courthouse?

Mr. SISSON. Yes. The old courthouse is about completed, and when the office of the recorder of deeds moved out it was intended that quarters should be provided in the courthouse when it was reconstructed.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Repairs—streets, avenues, and alleys: For current work of repairs of streets, avenues, and alleys, including resurfacing and repairs to asphalt pavements with the same or other not inferior material, and including the purchase of one motor truck at not to exceed \$2,000, and maintenance of motor vehicles, and including an allowance of not to exceed \$30 per month for an automobile for use for official purposes, \$375,000. This appropriation shall be available for repairing pavements of street railways when necessary; the amounts thus expended shall be collected from such railroad companies as provided by section 5 of "An act providing a permanent form of government for the District of Columbia," approved June 11, 1878, and shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriation for the fiscal year in which they are collected.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a question. Is it intended that this appropriation of \$375,000, with the unexpended appropriations appearing under the heading of "Work on streets and avenues," the unexpended balances, shall be taken together for use during the coming year for the repair of all the streets?

Mr. SISSON. That is practically true; but they are two different items. One is for the repair of streets and the other is for improvements. One is for tearing up old pavements and putting down new and the other is for resurfacing.

Mr. GARD. This last is for repair?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. GARD. And the other is for new work?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

Officers: Superintendent, \$6,000; assistant superintendents—1 \$3,500, 1 \$3,000; director of intermediate instruction, 13 supervising principals, supervisor of manual training, and director of primary instruction, 16 in all, at a minimum salary of \$2,200 each; secretary, \$2,000; financial clerk, \$2,000; clerks—1 \$1,600, 1 \$1,400, 1 \$1,200, 3 at \$1,000 each, 1 (to carry out the provisions of the child-labor law) \$900; 2 stenographers at \$1,000 each; messenger, \$720; in all, \$62,520.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee why it is that in making appropriations for the superintendents here that they have one at \$3,500 and one at \$3,000, each doing the same kind of work?

Mr. SISSON. That is fixed by law.

Mr. MADDEN. That is the law, is it not?

Mr. SISSON. Well, that is the law that fixes the salaries as they appear in the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. No; one is at \$2,700, while another doing the same work gets \$1,650.

Mr. SISSON. Well, I presume originally in fixing these salaries it was due to the fact that the service rendered was more important in one case than in another case because of the fact that more children were under them and more duty.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, I do not think that has anything to do with it at all myself. I think it is simply because one man is a white man and another is a black man. That is the way it looks.

Mr. SISSON. As a matter of fact that has been the salary carried for many years, and I think every member of the subcommittee will bear testimony to the fact that that question is never raised and never mentioned in our deliberations.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that when persons do equal work, whether they are men or women, and are charged with equal responsibility, are required to have the same educational qualifications, that they be compensated alike; and I think it is an injustice which ought to be remedied; and I move, Mr. Chairman, in the case where the salary is fixed in the one case at \$3,500 and the other at \$3,000 that both be made \$3,500.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, I do not think it is subject to the point of order. I would like the gentleman to state what the point of order is.

Mr. SISSON. There is no question about its being subject to the point of order, because originally the law fixed those salaries, and to change that now would make it subject to the point of order. There is no doubt about its being subject to the point of order. There is also an amendment which went into this bill some four or five years ago making the salaries carried in the preceding bill to be the salaries for this year, and to change the salary carried in the current law is also subject to the point of order under that provision carried in the bill several years ago.

Mr. MADDEN. Well, I think the estimates were made for similar salaries by the board of education and reduced by the commissioners, and it seems to me that it is competent for the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to increase the salaries, to raise the salaries, and I do not think it is a change of law to raise an appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has before him the act authorizing it, and if the gentleman from Illinois has a statute authorizing the payment of \$3,500—

Mr. MADDEN. I have not looked up the law on the question, I am free to admit. Now, if the gentleman will withhold the point of order—

Mr. SISSON. I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. I will address myself to the merits of the case. It seems, Mr. Chairman, that any law which requires one man to work for \$3,000 while another man doing similar work with equal responsibility gets \$3,500 is unjust, and there ought to be some remedy for it, and it seems to me that the committee having jurisdiction over this bill should see the injustice of the case and report an amendment to the law to remedy the evil, for it must be admitted to be an evil to require one man to do similar work for \$500 a year less than another. Every person occupying the position of director of education is required to stand the test of qualification. They are required to have similar educations, they are required to pass similar examinations, they are required to do similar work, and they ought to be granted similar pay, and it seems to me that the committee which would tolerate a discrimination of this sort has failed to give the kind of consideration to the question to which it is entitled. Of course, I realize that this committee, as all other committees, are anxious

to economize in every way they can, and while they are economizing they ought to do it where economy is the proper thing. Economy ought not to be practiced at the expense of the individual. It may be said that economy is not being practiced. It may be said that \$3,000 is all the pay that either of those men should get. I do not know about that. If that be true, of course it would be extravagant to pay one man \$3,500 where the other man is being paid \$3,000; but if it is not extravagant and it is thought that the salary is not more than commensurate with the responsibility of the work, then I submit that it is unjust to pay the one \$500 less than the other. I am not very clear, although I have not the law before me, that this item is subject to the point of order.

Mr. WHEELER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. I will.

Mr. WHEELER. The Chairman states it is fixed by statute. Are not the salaries of the commissioners fixed by statute?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. But I understand their salaries are now \$5,000, and it is proposed to make them \$6,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, if that is true, that is a change of statute, and I shall feel compelled to make the point of order against that.

Mr. WALSH. It is too late.

Mr. MADDEN. Unfortunately I was not here.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If the gentleman will yield, do I understand the duties of these superintendents are exactly alike?

Mr. MADDEN. Exactly alike.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman could reach the object he intends to reach of equalizing the salaries by moving to reduce.

Mr. MADDEN. That would be a change of law, too, I suppose.

Mr. DYER. That would not be subject to the point of order.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If their duties are precisely the same—

Mr. MADDEN. They are precisely the same. I do not think anyone will deny that. I think that there ought to be sufficient consideration for the equities in the case to equalize the salary of the man who is not getting within \$500 of the other man. I do not want to reduce the salary of the man who is getting the \$500 more, because I do not think he is getting more than he ought to have, but I do think this committee ought to have sufficient consideration for the justice of the case to offer an amendment or to withdraw the point of order and allow this increased compensation to be paid.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman a question about this. Do these two assistant superintendents have the same amount of work to do?

Mr. Sisson. Well, they have the same character of work to do, of course, but there are more than twice as many children under one superintendent as under the other. The assistant superintendent who gets the \$3,500, in the absence or illness of the superintendent, performs the duties of the superintendent. He happens to be the man who performs that duty. The assistant superintendent whose salary is fixed by law at \$3,000 performs the duty of assistant superintendent at all times.

Mr. DYER. The one that gets \$3,000 is a colored man?

Mr. Sisson. I understand he is a colored man, but I did not know myself until this moment that there was any difference. The question was never raised in the committee at all.

Mr. DYER. No recommendation was made to the gentleman's committee?

Mr. Sisson. There was a recommendation made to our committee to increase the salaries of every employee in the District government.

Mr. DYER. Well, the gentleman does not recall whether there was any recommendation by the commissioners to increase the pay of this one assistant superintendent?

Mr. Sisson. I do. They recommended an increase in salary for all these officials in this particular paragraph.

Mr. DYER. To make them equal or increase them all?

Mr. Sisson. My recollection is to make the assistant superintendent \$4,000; and I think they made them both \$4,000.

Mr. DYER. I would ask the gentleman also if it is not a fact that a number of items recommended by the school board were eliminated also?

Mr. Sisson. I do not know that a number of items were. I do not recall.

Mr. DYER. The ground for that new school known as the Dunbar High School—

Mr. Sisson. That is for the purchase of the site, and the only thing the committee did not allow that was asked for.

Mr. DYER. Does the gentleman know anything more about the salaries paid the different teachers in the different schools?

Does this inequality of pay which starts at the assistant superintendent—

Mr. Sisson. If the gentleman will turn to the longevity act he will find that all the teachers of every grade get exactly the same amount of money, and all the teachers' salaries were increased last year, notably the lower-grade teachers, and carried in the current law.

Mr. DYER. I have seen, and I suppose other Members have seen, communications touching these questions. I have one here where it says that the salaries paid to the white and colored teachers are not equalized; that the colored teachers all the way down do not receive the same pay as the white teachers.

Mr. Sisson. No. That is not true, because the status of the teachers is fixed by law. And if there has been any injustice done it has been done by the school board and not by your committee, because we have granted the salaries to teachers in lump sums to pay a certain number of teachers in a certain grade. We do not fix the salaries in this bill of any of the teachers except the principals of certain schools and the administrative force of the school system. If the gentleman will look in the bill he will find of the two thousand and odd teachers that they are divided into groups and a certain amount of money is appropriated to pay the basic salary in that group. And then there is another statute—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DYER. Under the extension of remarks I insert the following:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BRANCH OF
THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT
OF COLORED PEOPLE,
Washington, D. C., December 5, 1918.

Hon. L. C. DYER,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DYER: I know it is only necessary to give you the figures concerning the colored schools that are contained in the District appropriation act, that will come up in the House on Monday, to secure support for us.

They do us gross injustice, giving us only 14.3 per cent, when we should have nearly one-third. There are also inequalities in the salaries for white and colored directors. The board of education gave us our proportion, but the commissioners eliminated the most important items, principally the ground for Dunbar High School and Stevens School. The children here have no recreational space whatever, and are forced to play in the streets, under constant menace to their safety.

We have this trouble every year with these servants of all of the people, who receive their salaries from black as well as from white taxes, and are charged with the duty of improving the citizenry. Yet they studiously set to work to deny him the chance for education, the very source of citizenship. We feel particularly grieved at this time because of our heroic service in the world war for democracy, as we thought that it would and should mean a larger measure of opportunity for us. Certainly we did not expect the strong arm of municipal government, designed to serve the people, used as an instrument of oppression.

Knowing that we can count upon your support again, I have the honor to remain,

Very respectfully, yours,

NEVAL H. THOMAS.

Injustices to colored children in the estimates for 1919 for public schools.

White:	
Ground adjacent to Buchanan School	\$45,000
Ground adjacent to Wheatley School	25,000
Ground adjacent to Eaton School	12,500
Ground adjacent to Tenley School	5,000
Site west of Sixteenth Street for new building	40,000
Ground adjacent to Hayes School	6,500
Ground adjacent to Peabody School	14,000
Site for seventh division	35,000
Ground adjacent to Emery School	12,000
Site for 16-room building west of North Capitol Street	30,000
Equipment for McKinley High School	15,000

Total of estimates..... 240,000

Colored:	
Equipment for Armstrong Manual Training School	40,000
14.3 per cent for colored schools.	

Necessary items for colored schools; which the Board of Education recommended, but which the commissioners eliminated.

Ground for Dunbar High School	\$99,750
Ground adjacent to Langston School	4,500
Ground adjacent to Stevens School	31,000
Ground adjacent to Payne School	7,000
Ground adjacent to Armstrong School	19,000
Ground adjacent to Bruce School	13,500
Ground adjacent to Birney School	2,100
Ground adjacent to Logan School	35,000
Ground adjacent to Deanwood School	4,000
Ground adjacent to Banneker School	20,000
Ground adjacent to Douglass-Simmons School	9,000

Total of elimination..... 244,850

Discrepancies in salaries of white and colored directors who do the same work and differ only in the number of subordinates under them.

The commissioners reduced the estimates of the Board of Education for the colored directors.

Assistant superintendent:

White.....\$3,500
Colored.....3,000

The colored superintendent has larger supervision than the white, larger powers, duties, and responsibilities under the statute.

Director of primary instruction (maximum salary):

White.....\$2,700
Colored.....1,650

Directors of music, drawing, domestic art, kindergartens, primary instruction, and penmanship (maximum salary):

White.....\$2,000
Colored.....1,550

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to know what the position of the Chair was on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order was sustained. It is authorized by law.

Mr. MADDEN. I did not hear the Chair decide.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Appointments to fill vacancies hereafter occurring in the membership of the board of education shall be made by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MADDEN and Mr. WALSH reserved a point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, the item is subject to a point of order. If the gentlemen have made up their minds to insist on the point of order, I will not discuss it.

Mr. MADDEN. I will withhold it.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman insists on the point, the point of order is sustained.

Mr. Sisson. My request was if they would insist on the point of order at the conclusion of my remarks, I did not want to take up any time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Attendance officers: Attendance officers—1 \$900, 4 at \$800 each, 4 at \$600 each; in all, \$6,500.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I would like to move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a question.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the increase in the number of attendance officers.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order against what portion of the bill?

Mr. MADDEN. They have increased the number of attendance officers by two. That must be a change of law.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. You are reserving that point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes; I reserve it.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a question. I observe the same is true in this item concerning attendance officers—one at \$900, four at \$800 each—as occurs in the former paragraph, one assistant superintendent at \$3,500 and one at \$3,000. What I want to know is, Does the basic act prescribe a certain salary shall be paid to a certain assistant superintendent at a certain school?

Mr. Sisson. I do not believe the law commonly known as the longevity law, which classifies the teachers in the District of Columbia into classes, fixing their pay, deals with the attendance officers at all.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. What I am trying to get at is, Who determines which assistant superintendent or which attendance officer shall get one sum and which shall get another?

Mr. Sisson. Well, the attendance officer who has charge of all the attendance officers themselves is the man who supervises the attendance of the children. These others are appointed under this one attendance officer. The principal officer gets \$900, and then four get \$800, and those who begin get \$600. In order that the promotions may be had, after they are familiar with this service and this work, they are promoted out of the lower-grade pay into the higher grade.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Who determines in the preceding item which assistant superintendent shall receive \$3,500 and which shall get \$3,000?

Mr. Sisson. The board of education.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. They decide according to their judgment about the matter?

Mr. Sisson. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois insist upon his point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman from Mississippi any law which he can cite authorizing the increase?

Mr. Sisson. There is no law, Mr. Chairman, authorizing the increase of the attendance officers.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois make the point of order against the \$800 or the \$600?

Mr. MADDEN. I make it against the two in different places. They have four at \$800 instead of two.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the only portion the gentleman makes the point of order against?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. Sisson. Your committee gave them two additional attendance officers when they asked for four. Your committee thought that looking into the absences from school was a matter of considerable importance, and that to have enough attendance officers to attend to the duties would simply make more efficient the school system of the District.

Mr. TILSON. Is the number of attendance officers fixed by law anywhere? Is there a law that fixes the number of attendance officers?

Mr. Sisson. No. The only thing that fixes it is the fact that it has been carried in the statute for a number of years and under the provision put in an appropriation bill years ago those people carried at that salary should be paid the salary from that time on.

Mr. TILSON. And there is no law that would authorize one attendance officer at \$900, two at \$800, and four at \$600?

Mr. Sisson. There is no law except the current law.

Mr. TILSON. Do I understand from the gentleman that to be the fact?

Mr. Sisson. Yes. The gentleman is right about it. There is no statute that fixes the number, but when an item goes into the bill the salary fixed in the current law is the salary for that particular official for all time.

To give the history of that legislation, I may say that one gentleman would make a point of order where the salary had been carried for many years and would go back to the original act creating the office; he would look all those things up, and the result was that on account of making those points of order it became necessary for Congress to pass an act to prevent all the salaries in all the departments and in the District of Columbia from being reduced to what they were many years before. I have no doubt the gentleman recalls that legislation that we put into the appropriation bill, so that all items put in this bill, like this attendance item, are in order only under that particular act that I speak of, both as to salary and as to the number of officers carried in the bill. Therefore if we increase the number of attendance officers, I know of no statute other than the fact that the item has been carried in the bill authorizing the increase of attendance officers. I think the gentleman from Illinois is making a mistake in insisting upon the point of order. I think he will withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. Does the gentleman from Mississippi desire to offer an amendment?

Mr. Sisson. Yes. I desire to offer an amendment to make it "two" instead of "four."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 30, line 18, at the beginning of the line, insert the words "two at \$800 each."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. Sisson. One moment, Mr. Chairman. I ask unanimous consent that if any of the items of the bill are changed the Clerk may be authorized to change the totals.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that if items are changed the Clerk may be authorized to change the totals. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Principal of the Central High School, \$3,000: *Provided*, That the present principal of the Central High School shall be placed at a basic salary of \$3,000 per annum and shall be entitled to an increase of \$100 per annum for five years.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MADDEN. I reserve a point of order for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Mississippi a question. I want to know, if I may, why special language is employed to provide for the present principal of the Central High School?

Mr. SISSON. Well, the present principal of the Central High School is one of the most talented teachers in the District, one of the most talented men in the country. He is a man of great capacity, and we are extremely fortunate to be able to keep him. In fact, the board of education very seriously thought at the time the present superintendent was selected to make the superintendent of this school the superintendent of the city schools. He is one of the most widely known teachers in the District and is a man of very great ability, and the plant he is in charge of is one of the very largest in the country.

Mr. MADDEN. I have no doubt he is worth the money, but my purpose in rising was to get the information which the gentleman is now disclosing. I do not think I will insist upon the point of order in connection with this case or in connection with the next one.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the point of order.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Mississippi yield for another question?

Mr. SISSON. I do.

Mr. DOWELL. How long has this principal been in the service here in the city?

Mr. SISSON. A good many years. I could not tell the gentleman exactly, but it is a good long time. Of course, he has been principal of this Central High School since it was constructed and was principal of the old high school at the time they moved into the new Central High School. It is one of the most inviting looking plants in the country.

Mr. DOWELL. I notice in this language in the bill it states that "he shall be entitled to an increase of \$100 per annum for five years." Does that mean that he is to receive \$100 in addition each year, or that that will be fixed by the board?

Mr. SISSON. No. It means that after July, after the passage of this act, he would get next year \$3,100, and the year after \$3,200, and so on for five years.

Mr. DOWELL. This does not say he shall receive that, but that he shall be entitled to it.

Mr. SISSON. He will receive it.

Mr. DOWELL. Is he not worth as much now as he will be later, and should not the salary be fixed at the amount that would be commensurate with his service?

Mr. SISSON. That is true, but the basic salary carried in the law for this principal is \$3,000. So if you increased the basic salary you then would not give this extremely valuable man the benefit of what he is entitled to. Therefore your committee did not feel authorized to increase the basic salary of this teacher. I think we are extremely fortunate in holding the man at all. He has had many offers very much better than this, but he has a splendid institution, and he takes a great deal of pride in it.

Mr. DOWELL. In other words, it was the judgment of the committee that unless this principal remained the salary should be left at \$3,000.

Mr. SISSON. Yes; unless we can get an equally good man, I think the salary ought to remain at \$3,000.

Mr. WALSH. I move to strike out the last word. I am very glad that the gentleman from Illinois did not insist on the point of order to this item, because I have occasion to know of the excellence of this institution and to say that I have no doubt that the principal of this school could, if he so desired, command a much higher salary at similar schools in other cities of the country. The plant that he has under his care and charge there is a credit to the National Capital, and my observation has been that the corps of teachers that he supervises are most efficient, and I think it is a good thing that the subcommittee have attempted to provide for this yearly increase. I want to indorse the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of asking a question of the chairman of the committee. What is the meaning of the phrase "minimum salaries," in line 20?

Mr. SISSON. I will explain that to the gentleman.

Mr. GARD. Does that mean that under some circumstances an additional salary may be paid?

Mr. SISSON. This is the basic minimum salary. Upon that they get what is known as longevity pay. A teacher remains one year in a certain grade, at, say, \$100 a month, and the next year that teacher will get an increase of \$50 a year, and that continues for five years. We have nothing to do with that. That was provided for by law some years ago. You will notice a little further on in the bill an item for several hundred thousand dollars for longevity pay to the teachers in the District of Columbia.

Mr. GARD. I think one of the very best things about Washington is the general recognition of its excellent school system,

and I should be glad to contribute in any way I can to its maintenance.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make another inquiry. In reading the provisions of the bill relative to the principal of the Central High School I notice it says—

And shall be entitled to an increase of \$100 per annum for five years. I believe it is the intention that there shall be an increase of \$100 each year?

Mr. SISSON. That is the intention of the committee.

Mr. DOWELL. Does the language of the bill provide for an additional \$100 each year for five years?

Mr. SISSON. Yes; that is the language carried in all the items.

Mr. DOWELL. It seems to me that this might be construed as fixing the salary at \$3,100 for five years.

Mr. SISSON. No; an increase of \$100 each year for five years.

Mr. DOWELL. I understand; but it would seem from the reading of this provision that he can get no more than \$3,100 for the next five years.

Mr. SISSON. No; the second year \$3,200, the next year \$3,300, and so on.

Mr. DOWELL. I concede that to be the intention, but I will ask the gentleman to read this language again and see if that will be the effect of it.

Mr. SISSON. The auditor has repeatedly construed this language in the past. This is the language in which it is submitted, it is the language under which that system of longevity pay for teachers is carried on, and your committee accepted that language, which had been repeatedly construed by the auditor to mean an increase of \$100 each year for five years.

Mr. DOWELL. If the gentleman is certain that that is the construction which will be placed upon it, that is satisfactory to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Assistant principal of the Central High School, \$1,800: *Provided*, That said assistant principal shall be placed at a basic salary of \$1,800 per annum and shall be entitled to an increase of \$100 per annum for five years.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The assistant superintendent in a big plant like this ought to get more than \$1,800 if the superintendent gets \$3,000, it seems to me.

Mr. SISSON. This language has been carried before.

Mr. MADDEN. I suppose we never could change anything that has been carried before.

Mr. SISSON. I understand; but I want to explain to him that this assistant principal is actually getting more than \$1,800 at this time. I do not know just what salary he is receiving, but it is something over \$2,000 now.

Mr. MADDEN. This does not state the fact, then?

Mr. SISSON. The basic salary is all that is ever stated in the bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman state what the principal gets whose basic salary is stated at \$3,000?

Mr. SISSON. He only gets \$3,000, because this language only begins to apply to him this year.

Mr. MADDEN. The other man has had the benefit of the language before?

Mr. SISSON. For several years; I do not know just how long.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Principals of normal, high, and manual-training high schools, eight, at \$2,500 each—

Mr. GARD. I desire to ask the chairman of the committee whether the language carried on lines 5 and 6, page 31—

Principals of normal, high, and manual-training high schools, eight, at \$2,500 each.

refers to the straight salary, or is that a basic salary upon which additional salary is computed?

Mr. SISSON. The \$2,500 is the salary without any longevity.

Mr. GARD. That is the salary which is fixed at \$2,500 for these principals?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, is there any reason why these salaries should not be fixed in this bill at a certain amount, and not have a basic salary and then receive some other amount?

Mr. SISSON. The longevity pay is continually changing. In other words, a person occupying one of these places may die or resign. The new teacher begins at the basic salary. The longevity pay is not calculated at the beginning of the session, but it is calculated by the number of months. If a teacher should

die or resign the first part of the session and a new teacher should come into that place, then after teaching the number of school months required to give longevity pay it would be given. The longevity pay for a particular teacher may begin in the middle of the next session.

I might say to the gentleman that I myself am not at all in favor of the longevity law as now written. Some years ago I tried to change the longevity law but did not succeed.

Mr. DOWELL. In other words, the longevity pay is not fixed for the position but for the individual?

Mr. Sisson. It is fixed for the position, and when the individual gets into that position and remains long enough the longevity pay attaches to the individual.

Mr. GARD. Is the gentleman in a position to say whether he would accept a proposal to change the salary of the assistant principal of the high school and the dean for the girls' central school to, say, \$2,000 a year?

Mr. Sisson. The great trouble about accepting that would be that we would have to go all through the bill. The salaries have been arranged with some effort at harmony, although they do not always harmonize. Of course, I could not consent to that change here.

Mr. GARD. Does the gentleman think such change would be advisable?

Mr. Sisson. I do not, in view of the longevity pay.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I am going to attempt to explain what little I know about the longevity pay. I have been on the committee a good many years, but I have been unable to ascertain from any source whatever the real working of longevity pay. Apparently a few years ago there was regular legislation along that line, and they agreed upon a certain principle for increasing salaries of teachers automatically regardless of merit. As an illustration I will note on page 31, line 8:

Provided, That said assistant principals shall be placed at a basic salary of \$1,800 per annum and shall be entitled to an increase of \$100 per annum for five years.

Now as to some teachers that would read \$50 per annum instead of \$100. But if gentlemen will notice, probably in the next bill, in the next Congress, you will find an omission of that increase of \$100 because the basic salary being fixed at \$1,800, that will be omitted, and then no one knows except the auditor of the District of Columbia how much salary the teacher is getting. He will refer back to this law and find that last year it was fixed at \$1,800 with \$100 longevity pay, and that two years from now it will be \$200 additional without being stated in the bill. It rises automatically. We appropriate money and leave it to the auditor to figure up the complex system of longevity pay. Next year that assistant's salary will be simply \$1,800, but when the auditor figures up the salary he pays it out of a lump sum and he will get \$1,900.

Miss RANKIN. If you had a new assistant, he would go in at \$1,800?

Mr. DAVIS. He would go in at the basic salary and then when he stays long enough the longevity pay begins to accumulate.

Miss RANKIN. Then in this bill we are fixing the basic salary at \$1,800?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; for this one, and he may be getting \$1,600 as a basic salary and longevity pay running him up to \$1,800, and now we propose to start him new again on a basic salary of \$1,800 instead of \$1,400 or \$1,500 or \$1,600 which he may be getting now. This increases the pay of the teachers automatically right along.

Miss RANKIN. As long as we are fixing the basic salary at \$1,800, would it not be in order to fix it at \$2,000?

Mr. DAVIS. I think it could be done, but subject to a point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Why so? It is as much in order to make it \$2,000 as it is \$1,800.

Mr. Sisson. The law fixes the amount of longevity in the different classes in which the teachers fall. If you look at the longevity law, you will find a table.

Mr. DAVIS. We do not fix the longevity; we are fixing the basic salary.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from Minnesota has replied to the question of the lady from Montana and said that the basic salary up to this time was in the neighborhood of \$1,600.

Mr. DAVIS. I do not know just what it is; perhaps \$1,500 or \$1,000.

Mr. MADDEN. If we make it \$1,800 now, we are changing the law.

Mr. DAVIS. No; we are operating in accordance with the longevity pay.

Mr. MADDEN. The longevity pay has nothing to do with the basic salary.

Mr. DAVIS. We have a right to change the basic salary when the teacher has arrived at the limit of the longevity pay. When that has expired we change the basic salary.

Mr. MADDEN. This man will get \$2,000 now?

Mr. DAVIS. He gets \$1,900 for this year.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman from Mississippi says he is getting \$2,000.

Mr. Sisson. I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota that this item has been carried for two or three years in the bill.

Mr. DAVIS. I thought we had fixed a new basic salary at \$1,800; that is the principle we are working on.

Mr. Sisson. The gentleman is right as to his method of calculating longevity pay.

Mr. TILSON. If the gentleman will yield, I would like to ask him, How do you arrive at the total of the bill? How do you arrive at the footing unless you know how many increases there have been?

Mr. DAVIS. We can not arrive at that with any definiteness whatever, so we always add sufficient money in a lump sum in order that the superintendent of instruction and the auditor of the District will be sure to have money enough to pay for these teachers when they figure what they are entitled to.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Connecticut will look on page 34, he will find an item which will be illuminating upon the question that he asks—\$450,000 for longevity pay. That money may or may not be used, owing to whether or not the audited claims will absorb it. Frequently some of that is carried back into the Treasury.

Mr. TILSON. You have a large lump sum in order to take care of these elastic salaries?

Mr. Sisson. We have to do it.

Mr. DAVIS. And I would say to the gentleman that if he was on this committee he would find it very difficult to ascertain the exact amount necessary to pay salaries under this longevity system.

Mr. WHEELER. Does the gentleman know how many there are who come under this longevity rule?

Mr. DAVIS. Virtually all of them.

Mr. WHEELER. The committee figures intelligently and knows exactly how many are entitled to the raise?

Mr. DAVIS. We do.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I would like to inquire if this longevity-pay system can not be figured up? As I understood the gentleman, he said there was no way of telling what this pay would be.

Mr. DAVIS. I say that my services upon the committee for the last six or eight years have shown me that I have been unable to get any information satisfactory to myself or to anyone else as to what constitutes this longevity pay.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have no doubt about the gentleman's statements, but I wondered whether it was because of the complexity of the system or whether the officials whose duty it is to make these computations could not tell.

Mr. DAVIS. I think the complexity of the system is to blame.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think it ought to be changed.

Mr. DAVIS. I think so, too; but if you will attempt to change it you will run up against much opposition.

Mr. WHEELER. I understood the gentleman to say he knew how many there are.

Mr. DAVIS. How many teachers, and how often they change their basic salaries.

Mr. DOWELL. Does the gentleman state that the assistant under this paragraph can receive more than the \$1,800 with the \$100 added?

Mr. DAVIS. That is all for next year. The following year he will receive another additional hundred dollars, which will be \$2,000, and the next year \$2,100, and then \$2,200, and so on until the five years have elapsed.

Mr. DOWELL. Was the basic salary of this assistant fixed in any other bill at \$1,800?

Mr. DAVIS. I do not think so, but I would not say positively. In my judgment, perhaps the man who is now getting \$1,800 under this bill previously had a basic salary of \$1,200 or \$1,400.

Mr. DOWELL. Does the gentleman know that that is true?

Mr. DAVIS. I do not know it, because you must know that there are a great many thousand teachers, and to keep all of them in mind is difficult.

Mr. DOWELL. The question is, Does the committee fix the basic salaries upon the accumulations of another basic salary with the increase?

Mr. DAVIS. They have a right to, and they frequently do that, and that is the only way we have of having something to say as to the merits of a teacher.

Mr. DOWELL. And of changing the salaries?

Mr. DAVIS. Yes; and it has frequently been the fact that many school-teachers in the District have received increases in salary when the public knew nothing about it, and perhaps the committee that does the business was being censured for not increasing salaries.

Mr. DOWELL. There are some others that ought to have their salaries raised more than they have been.

Mr. DAVIS. And probably that would have been done this year were it not for a certain order that was promulgated to the effect, "Let salaries alone for the present."

The Clerk read as follows:

The recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia is authorized and directed to pay for copying instruments filed for record in his office 40 per cent of the fees collected by him for filing, indexing, and recording said instruments, and the same rate of compensation for making copies of the records of his office, and employees of the office of the recorder of deeds of the District of Columbia when employed therein by the day shall receive compensation at the rate of \$2.50 for each day so employed, payable out of the fees and emoluments of said office.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. My understanding is, and I wish to be corrected if I am wrong, that the director of primary instruction and the assistant director of primary instruction and the directors and assistants in all cases, except in the high schools, or in schools that are so large that the one school needs a superintendent and an assistant superintendent, have equal work to do; that, as a matter of fact, the assistant superintendent is in reality a superintendent of a distinct school, not the assistant superintendent under a superintendent, but a superintendent of a school doing the work that the man or woman, as the case may be, who is classified as superintendent does, and that because of the fact that we give them the title of assistant superintendent we give them less pay. The reason why they get the title of assistant superintendent instead of the title of superintendent is that one is black and the other is white. Nobody disputes that, I think, and I think that ought not to be the case. There was no discrimination in the selection of men who fought the battles of the country in France. All were charged with equal responsibility. Everyone was drafted who was qualified to serve. All you needed were the mental and physical qualifications and citizenship in the United States to make you subject to the military service of your country. If one-tenth of the population of the United States furnished one-tenth of the soldiers to defend the flag, there is no justification why people of that race should be classed as unworthy of equal compensation for equal work.

There was no discrimination between the pay of soldiers of different races. In the American Army all were Americans, all were treated as Americans, all were sent up against the guns of the Germans. There was no thought that a man should be saved because he was black or white. The one purpose of the Army was to win the war and nobody was allowed to go into the Army unless he was a citizen, and I believe now that the country ought to recognize the work of its citizens by giving them an equal chance, and where a citizen of the United States, no matter what his color or his creed may be or his nationality, proves himself qualified to perform the functions of the office to which he has been appointed that he ought to be given equal compensation just as long as he is able to fill the bill, and it does not make any difference who he is if he is not qualified he ought not to be allowed to retain the place, but just as long as he retains the place there ought not to be any distinction in compensation. He should be required to qualify not when he entered upon the job, but as long as he continued to hold the job, and the very moment that he proves himself unqualified or unworthy he ought to be dismissed, but while he is in the service he ought to be given equal consideration and there ought not under any circumstances to be any legislation passed by the Congress of the United States discriminatory against any citizens of the Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Assistant directors of music, drawing, physical culture, domestic science, domestic art, kindergartens, and penmanship, 7, at \$1,300 each: *Provided*, That the assistant director of penmanship, who shall be an instructor in the normal school and an assistant director in the grades, shall be placed at a basic salary of \$1,300 per annum and shall be entitled to an increase of \$50 per annum for five years.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to ask the gentleman from Mississippi if all these basic salaries have been changed in this bill or whether this is something that has been carried for a long time.

Mr. Sisson. What item?

Mr. MADDEN. Page 32, assistant directors of music, and so forth.

Mr. Sisson. No; no basic salary has been changed in this bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Is this language carried in the last bill?

Mr. Sisson. We did change some basic salaries last year and a great many of the changes of basic salary were carried in last year's appropriation bill increasing the teachers who were paid less than we thought they were entitled to under the basic salary; but in this bill no basic salary has been changed at all.

Mr. MADDEN. I was just asking for information, and I am thankful to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Group A of class 6, including 7 principals of grade manual-training schools, 334, at \$1,000 each.

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 32, line 16, strike out \$1,000 and insert \$1,200.

Mr. Sisson. Does the lady from Montana desire that I reserve the point of order? I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the lady from Montana desire to be heard?

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that \$1,000 for a principal of a grade manual-training school is altogether too little to offer a teacher, and it seems to me there should be some place where Congress could change this salary to at least \$1,200 a year. We find that teachers are leaving schools all over the country to take other work because they can get a better salary, and we know that the grade of teachers who seek the work is not up to the standard that it was a few years ago.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, for the information of the House, in addition to the salary carried in this item, each principal of a grade school gets \$30 per annum per room. If he has eight rooms he gets \$30 per annum for each room under the law. Most of these schools are eight rooms, some are more than eight, so they get eight times \$30, in addition to the amount carried in the bill, and there is rarely a school in the city where those particular teachers do not get that amount of money, \$240, in addition to this pay.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order of the gentleman from Mississippi is that this is not authorized by law?

Mr. Sisson. Not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman the statute before him?

Mr. Sisson. The statute is here.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has the statute. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I was interested in the statement made by the gentleman from Mississippi a moment ago to the effect that if one of these principals presided over an eight-room school in addition to \$1,000 he gets \$30 per room per annum. I am interested to find out how that qualification came to be made, why that was made the basis of compensation, why it was that when the qualification was originally made the salary was not fixed definitely rather than part of the salary fixed definitely and part fixed on the number of rooms.

Mr. Sisson. I will state to the gentleman that when his party had control of the House in 1906 they passed a law in 1906 fixing additional compensation of principals in these schools so that they would get \$30 for each additional room. Now, I am inclined to believe there is some justice in the law which was passed, some fairness in it, because the supervisory work that a principal does would be largely dependent upon the number of rooms of which he had control. Now, if you look on page 35 of the bill, which you have there, you will find an item to pay this additional amount of money which is provided by law for this class of teachers.

Mr. MADDEN. I was very much interested in hearing the gentleman's statement, but of course I did not want to let it go without giving him an opportunity to explain it in full, as I knew he would be able to do.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Class 3, 543 at \$750 each.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a question. Is there any provi-

ston in the law for increase in the other classes, for the teachers in the class just now being read by the Clerk?

Mr. SISSON. No; except the longevity. What is being read here now is the base pay of the teachers.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman explain to the committee how much these teachers in these classes of \$950, \$800, and \$750 actually receive under the system that the gentleman has explained here?

Mr. SISSON. The gentleman will have to get the longevity table, which I have here in this statute. You will find the class and the teacher designated here.

Mr. DOWELL. Here are two classes, for example, the ones receiving \$800 and the ones receiving \$750. Can the gentleman explain to the committee what those teachers are actually receiving under the system adopted?

Mr. SISSON. Now, they receive, of course, the base pay the first year.

Mr. DOWELL. That is, \$800?

Mr. SISSON. Eight hundred dollars. Now, if a teacher has been teaching one year, he or she gets \$830, and then gets \$860 the next year, and \$890 the next year, and so on—\$30 a year for 10 years.

Mr. DOWELL. And that applies also to the \$750 class?

Mr. SISSON. That class does not appear in the longevity law, because in last year's bill we changed the base pay of class 1 from \$500 to \$750, and class 2 from \$600 to \$750, and class 3 from \$650 to \$750, thus eliminating so far as salary is concerned the difference in the pay of the three lower-grade teachers. Now, in each of those grades, in addition to the \$750, they get the same longevity that they got when they carried a base salary of \$500 and \$525, getting \$25 increase each year. Now, the gentleman will have to look back at the statutes and see the longevity pay in order to determine just exactly how it all works out. And then if he will take and look it over carefully and give it some very careful thought he will find the rule is a very simple one. But it is very difficult when you try to apply it to teachers getting over \$2,000 and get the exact amount.

Mr. DOWELL. It is either very difficult or I am unable to get all of it, because I know in the bill there are certain classes, giving the number of teachers, with the pay of \$750. Now, according to the statement of the gentleman, the actual amount that these teachers receive depends upon the number of years they have taught. Is that correct?

Mr. SISSON. Perhaps the reason the gentleman is confused is because the longevity pay does not appear in this item, but if the gentleman will look over on page 34 he will find an item of \$450,000 for the purpose of paying the longevity pay of the teachers carried on page 32, and so on. In other words, the teachers get the 10-year longevity pay in these lower classes, the lowest longevity pay being \$25, and the next longevity pay being \$30 a year. Those two are carried as long as the teacher remains in that particular class and carry an increase of \$25 a year in one case and \$30 in the next case, until they have been in the school for 10 years or are transferred to a higher grade.

Mr. DOWELL. I am utterly unable to understand how people can live in the city of Washington on \$750 or \$800 a year.

Mr. SISSON. They do not get that this year, because they get \$120 lump sum, which is added to this salary.

I will state to the gentleman that your subcommittee realized that the lower-grade teachers were not getting the salaries which we would like to give them, but we are giving them more than the law authorized, and we are giving them more than the average pay in any of the cities throughout the country. We went into the matter at the time we made these increases. And I do not believe that either the gentleman who is now talking or any other gentleman in the House is more friendly to giving the school-teachers a proper salary than every member of this committee. Every member of the subcommittee has been in favor of giving them a substantial increase in their salary.

Miss RANKIN. May I ask the gentleman if he means to state if we were to try to get 100 new teachers for class 3 they would go in on that basic salary of \$750 a year now?

Mr. SISSON. Plus \$120; a total of \$870.

Miss RANKIN. And the longevity rule does not apply to this \$750?

Mr. SISSON. It does; but it does not apply the first year.

Miss RANKIN. It never applies to the new teachers until they have served—

Mr. SISSON. It only applies to the new teacher who has taught one session. For the second session they get longevity pay.

Miss RANKIN. How did you change the basic pay last year to \$750 in class 3?

Mr. SISSON. From \$500 to \$750?

Miss RANKIN. By amending this?

Mr. SISSON. Yes.

Miss RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The lady from Montana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Miss RANKIN: Page 32, line 20, strike out "\$750" and insert "\$1,000."

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. Did the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. DOWELL] desire to be recognized?

Mr. DOWELL. I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question.

Mr. SISSON. I will answer it if I can.

Mr. DOWELL. The statement made by the gentleman a moment ago was that he was willing to increase this pay, and if he will withdraw the point of order I am certain the committee will increase the pay, as it ought to be done.

Mr. SISSON. I do not know whether they would or not. I am here now as a servant of the committee, but I do say that for many years the teachers went in at \$500, and the subcommittee recommended to the full committee of this House—

Mr. DOWELL. The gentleman is aware that under the present conditions the teachers can not live in Washington on \$750 a year?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I think the compensation allowed under the recommendation of the committee is the most beggarly compensation that was ever granted to intelligent people; and they must be intelligent in order to be teachers. I think that no class of America's citizens makes as great a sacrifice in their life work as do the teachers of our public schools. Never by any chance, no matter how long they remain in the work, can they put anything aside for old age. Their work is more self-sacrificing than the work of the men on the battle line. Patriotism is the watchword with those who devote their lives to teaching the children of the country.

They occupy a position in the land more important than that occupied by any other class of our citizens. Upon their ability and patriotism and devotion depends the future citizenship of America. The education—intellectual, physical, moral—of the coming citizens of the country is under their charge, and it seems to me that those who are responsible for the development of the public educational institutions of the United States ought to regard the places of school-teachers as among the most responsible places that are to be filled. They ought to regard the necessity for proper compensation.

These girls or men, as the case may be, are required to have a college education. They are required, after they get through with their college course, to go to the Normal Training School for Teachers for a year or two. They are required to become experts in the life work which they follow. There is no other expert class of men or women in America who are called upon to make the sacrifice which these people are expected to make.

The conditions that have surrounded their lives since the beginning of the war in Europe have been as onerous as the conditions surrounding the lives of other people. Girls without any knowledge, without any experience, with substantially no education, have been called into the service of the Government since the war began to do filing work in the Government offices, not only here in Washington, but everywhere throughout the land, and they have been given anywhere from \$1.100 to \$1,300 and \$1,400 a year without any knowledge whatever; and yet here these women who have given years of their early life to acquire an education to fit them for the work to which they propose to devote their lives are compelled by the dictum of the Congress of the United States, so far as the District of Columbia is concerned, to live on starvation wages. It is a shame.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask for five minutes more, Mr. Chairman. I think this is a very interesting theme.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. The cost of living in the District of Columbia has soared so that nobody can calculate it. The wise gentlemen on the District appropriation subcommittee tell us that they do not understand what longevity pay means or how it shall be calculated, but they can readily understand that you can not get more to-day for a dollar than you could ordinarily get before for about 40 cents. They tell me that you can not rent a room anywhere in the District of Columbia without paying \$40 or \$50 a month for it, and if you can get your breakfast and can get anything to eat with it for \$1.50 you are doing well.

Now, if these girls are called upon to work for \$525, or say \$750 now, how do they manage to live? There is no other city in the Union that pays its teachers so niggardly a salary as this city does. And who is to blame? The Congress of the United States. Who else could be to blame? We ought to have a broader vision. We ought to realize that here at the Nation's Capital we should have the very best talent that can be employed in our schools, and we doubtless have, but we have compelled the talent that we do employ to work at starvation wages. Many of them have been compelled to leave the work which they intended to follow as their life work and take other employment in order that they might keep body and soul together and buy a few clothes to wear. It is a shame. It would not be tolerated anywhere else, and we who speak for the American people do not speak their sentiments when we ask these girls, these women, and frequently men, to work for this standard of wages. I think we ought not to start anyone in a work like this on less than \$1,000 a year, after they have spent 10 years of their early life in preparing for the work, qualifying themselves to do the thing which we require them to do in order to build up a high standard of citizenship from our children. We ought to encourage them with the hope that they will at least be able to live in a decent way.

Now I yield to my colleague.

Mr. WHEELER. Never mind. It is all right.

Mr. MADDEN. I said what the gentleman wanted me to say, did I?

So I say that, instead of making points of order against the increase of compensation, this committee ought to be devising ways and means to find out how we can enact a law that will give them compensation commensurate with the sacrifice which they make. Teachers of the public schools command the respect of the American people to a higher degree and to a greater extent than any other people in the Nation. They deserve it. They make more sacrifice. There is no hope for them. They live in an atmosphere which breaks them down nervously, and when they are no longer able to perform the work for which they are employed they are thrown out like a piece of driftwood. They will not keep them unless they are qualified. If you pension them, you pension them out of the savings which they themselves make. They are required to contribute to the pension roll, and frequently it happens that the pension fund which accumulates out of their own savings is dissipated by those who manage the funds, so that as the teachers grow old in the service they find themselves unable even to get the pension from the fund to which they paid. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I fully agree with what my colleague [Mr. MADDEN] has said, and it does seem to me that the committee has been very considerate to the District Commissioners in recommending that their salaries be raised \$1,000, while the poor school-teachers and the poor fellows on the police force and some patrol drivers and station messengers, working for \$750 or \$800 per annum, starvation wages, have not been considered at all.

Mr. Eldlitz, head of the Housing Corporation, I believe, is trying to make contracts now with clerks here by which they will be furnished with a room and two meals for \$45 per month. A single person could not meet all his expenses at \$75 per month. There are any number of employees here in the District of Columbia who have families, some of them three or four or five children. It is necessary for them to rent houses with five or six rooms and to clothe and feed and school those children. They can not possibly make both ends meet at \$1,000 per annum. They are not considered at all by this committee. The increasing of salaries of teachers and other underpaid em-

ployees the chairman of the committee objects to because these salaries are fixed by statute, but at the same time the committee overlook that provision of the statute when it comes to raising the salaries of the District Commissioners. It seems to me that they are unjust to the little fellow who receives starvation wages and who can not meet all expenses at his present salary.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read. The Clerk read as follows:

Class 2, 364 at \$750 each.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I was unable to be here when this matter of the salaries of teachers was first taken up, my attention being occupied with the case of an insane soldier.

I understand that the board of education last year recommended to the District Commissioners an increased appropriation of over \$200,000 for the colored schools of this District, but that the recommendation was rejected, no attention being paid to it by the District Commissioners. This year the board of education recommended \$245,350 for the colored schools, and practically no attention was paid to that. Now, I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the colored children represent 31 per cent of the total enrollment of the children in the public schools in the District of Columbia, and that the present commissioners did not recommend an appropriation of more than 10 per cent of the total appropriation for the colored schools.

Mr. SISSON. Will the gentleman yield just a moment?

Mr. DALLINGER. Yes.

Mr. SISSON. The great trouble about that statement is that it is not a fact.

Mr. DALLINGER. I should like to know what the fact is.

Mr. SISSON. The fact is that \$910,000 was appropriated in the last bill for new school buildings in the District of Columbia. Of that amount none has been used. It is available now. In my remarks during the general debate I fully explained the reason why it has not been used. It was because they could not get the labor and could not get the material, because the War Industries Board would not allow it to be transported. Therefore they could not use any of that money. Now, if you will go through these items, you will find that about 33½ per cent of them are for the colored schools, which have about one-third of the children.

Mr. DALLINGER. I have been informed by those who know something about the colored schools in the District that the contrary is the case. I want to ask the chairman of the committee if it is not a fact that the board of education recommended \$245,350 to the commissioners for the colored schools?

Mr. SISSON. I do not know. Those recommendations never reach us. The only things that reach us are the recommendations of the commissioners. The board of education deals with the subcommittee on appropriations only in reference to teachers and not in reference to school buildings or school property.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, my authority for the statement which I made is on page 1091 of the estimates submitted by the board of education to the District Commissioners; and, as I stated, these recommendations have been ignored repeatedly. The fact is that the colored schools are being discriminated against in this District, as they are in some other parts of the country. Now, I was not here when the amendment was proposed by the gentleman from Illinois for the increase of salary of one of the assistant superintendents of schools from \$3,000 to \$3,500. The fact is that these two assistant superintendents originally received the same salary. One of them, who is a white man, has had his salary raised to \$3,500, and the other one's salary has not been raised, simply because he is a colored man. That is the fact. You may just as well face it. Now, this colored man is a man who is a credit to any race, a graduate of Howard University, highly educated and admirably qualified for his position, and he is discriminated against simply because he is colored. I think it is pretty small business for a point of order to be made against that amendment by the committee. It was made last year when I offered it. I understand it was made this year when it was offered by the gentleman from Illinois, and I want to tell the gentleman from Mississippi that the time is coming when the colored children of this District are going to receive just and equal treatment, so far as their needs for education are concerned, and that time is coming pretty quickly, too.

Mr. SISSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman that the remarks which he has made ought not to be pointed at me. On the contrary, there has not been one word said in the subcommittee or elsewhere as to whether a teacher was colored or white. Not only that, but my associates on the committee will bear testimony, sir, that without a single excep-

tion wherever a public school is needed, irrespective of whether it is white or colored, it has received my support. I have not made the least discrimination one way or the other. I think it comes in very poor grace for the gentleman to single me out because, as a member of this subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, it is my duty to take care of the bill presented by the committee; and if the gentleman ever gets to be the chairman of a committee and has charge of a bill on the floor when that side is in power, he will be called upon to do the same thing, and it will be his duty to take care of the bill as reported from the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The salaries appropriated herein for teachers in classes 1, 2, and 3, clerks, and librarians in all classes during the fiscal year 1920, shall be in lieu of the present basic or initial salaries for such classes and the present rates of longevity increases of pay for the said classes shall apply to the basic or initial salaries appropriated herein: *Provided*, That for the year ending June 30, 1920, each of the teachers, clerks, and librarians in said classes shall receive placing in the class to which assigned, so that each teacher shall receive in addition to the basic salary herein provided a longevity increase which shall be equal to the longevity increase which is next above that received June 30, 1919.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The mention of longevity pay in this paragraph calls for some remarks. I think it ought to be stated that the schools of Washington are not what they ought to be. They do not compare with the schools in many other cities of the country. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Sisson] has stated, contrary to the opinion of some of the other Members here, that we are paying higher salaries than the average city. I do not know how that may be. I think the salaries of the majority of the teachers are insufficient. But I am very decidedly of the opinion that there are a large number of teachers who are paid altogether too much. The curse of this longevity system has rested upon these schools, and we never will have good schools in the District as long as it prevails. Take a teacher who is full of ambition, who inspires his class and brings all the students up on edge, and they finish their examinations with credit. What is the difference? He gets just the same pay. Take another teacher who cares nothing about how the class progresses, and to cite an instance which I have known in this city where two-thirds of the class fail in their examinations. Anyone knows that that is a disgrace to the teacher, for a teacher with capacity would get better results. But longevity pay is added to the salary of the teacher and everything goes on just the same. We have here in these schools too many old freaks and fossils, whose intentions may be good, but who were back numbers 10 or 20 years ago, and ought to have been retired. There is, however, no proper provision for their retirement. The schools are weighed down with them, the scholars laugh at them, but they get longevity pay. If longevity was any evidence of capacity, these elderly people ought to receive twice as much as they are getting.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. GARD. Is there no way to eliminate the freaks and fossils and the incompetent teachers?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Not under the present system, but there ought to be a way. It has been suggested that possibly there is authority in the board of education that controls the hiring of teachers, but I think not.

Mr. DAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. I think your committee has made a start in that direction, to which I hope the gentleman will not raise the point of order.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Not I, I assure the gentleman.

Mr. DAVIS. On page 34, at the bottom of the page, after the figures "\$450,000," is a provision:

Provided, That hereafter the board of education is authorized, on recommendation of the superintendent of schools, to withhold the longevity increase of any teacher because of an unsatisfactory efficiency rating.

This is the first time that this has appeared in the bill, and I hope there will be no point of order made to it.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I certainly will make no point of order upon it. I have sat here several years and have sometimes known some movements to be made in that direction, but they were promptly stifled by a point of order or in some other way.

Mr. DAVIS. I think this is subject to a point of order.

Mr. Sisson. Oh, no; I hope the gentleman will not admit that.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. It will not be made by me, but we ought to go considerably further. I presume the committee

thought, in consideration of past experience, that they would do well if they got this provision through. I will say to the gentleman—and I thank him for calling my attention to that, because it escaped my notice—I am glad that they have gone that far, but we ought to have some provision so that when the general superintendent or the superintendent of the school knows where the work is not being done up to the mark and knows where he can get a competent and efficient and ambitious young teacher, the superintendent will be able to go out and secure him. That is the way the schools are brought up elsewhere and the only way that you can have the schools that you ought to have in this District. I hope the House, which pays little attention to these matters, will wake up to its duty.

I may be incorrectly informed, but I have been told that this longevity system is preserved largely because the teachers of the District are in favor of it. If so, I want to say that it does not show the proper spirit on their part. The teachers ought not to be in favor of any such rule. They ought to favor a system whereby those who do the best work will receive the best pay. It is a system that stifles ambition and discourages all attempts to be perfect in their work. The teachers are few who can resist its effect. It can not help but injure the schools from one end to the other. The teachers' pay should be fixed from year to year in accordance with the work performed and not in accordance with the time that they have served. The principal's salary should not be fixed in accordance with the number of rooms, although there is some reason for that provision, but none can be given for the longevity pay. As long as the blight of the longevity system rests upon the schools, so long they will be inefficient. The whole school system of the city needs overhauling and rebuilding. The longevity system should be abolished; a pension system, with a provision for compulsory retirement when the work of the teacher is not up to the proper standard, should be provided; all of the teachers should be marked and graded on their work under a more complete plan of supervision than any which has been used, and new blood with new methods should be brought in by obtaining teachers from outside. This is the only way in which real schools can be maintained, no matter how good your superintendents or high-school principals may be.

The Clerk read as follows:

Longevity pay: For longevity pay for director of intermediate instruction, supervising principals, supervisor and assistant supervisor of manual training, principals of normal high and manual training high schools, the assistant principal of the Central High School, the assistant principal (who shall be dean of girls) of the Central High School, principals of grade manual training schools, heads of departments, director and assistant director of primary instruction, directors and assistant directors of drawing, physical culture, music, domestic science, domestic art, kindergartens, and penmanship, teachers, clerks, librarians and clerks, and librarians to be paid in strict conformity with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the board of education of the District of Columbia," approved June 20, 1906, as amended by the acts approved May 26, 1908, May 18, 1910, and June 26, 1912, \$450,000: *Provided*, That hereafter the board of education is authorized, on recommendation of the superintendent of schools, to withhold the longevity increase of any teacher because of an unsatisfactory efficiency rating.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the provision after the figures "\$450,000," in line 21, down to and including the word "rating," in line 25.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Central High School (New): Engineer, \$1,500; 2 assistant engineers, at \$900 each; electrician, \$1,200; 4 firemen, at \$720 each; 2 coal passers, at \$540 each; janitor, \$1,100; 3 assistant janitors, at \$900 each; gardener, \$840; night watchman, \$720; 2 charwomen, at \$480 each; 15 laborers, at \$500 each; in all, \$22,280.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I observe that the salary of the janitor is fixed at \$1,100. I want to ask the gentleman if the janitor gets indirectly any more pay? Does he get quarters free?

Mr. Sisson. No; he gets no quarters. Of course, he gets the \$120 increase provided for all employees.

Mr. LONGWORTH. He gets no perquisites?

Mr. Sisson. None whatever.

The Clerk read as follows:

Dunbar High School: Engineer, \$1,200; assistant engineer, \$1,000; two firemen, at \$720 each; coal passer, \$540; janitor, \$1,000; assistant janitor, \$900; nine laborers, at \$500 each; two charwomen, at \$480 each; night watchman, \$720; in all, \$12,260.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask if the laborers give all of their time? Here are nine laborers, at \$500 each. Do they give all their time to the work?

Mr. Sisson. No; the laborers are not employed until the buildings are closed.

The Clerk read as follows:

Medical inspectors: Chief medical and sanitary inspector, who shall, under the direction of the health officer of the District of Columbia, give his whole time to, and exercise the direction and control of, the medical inspection and sanitary conditions of the public schools of the District of Columbia, \$2,500; 16 medical inspectors of public schools, 1 of whom shall be a woman, 4 shall be dentists, and 4 shall be of the colored race, at \$500 each; in all, \$10,500.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi if they can get a doctor of good standing, a first-class man, to give all his time to the medical care of the schools for \$2,500?

Mr. SISSON. I think they have a very good man in charge of this work.

The Clerk read as follows:

For contingent expenses, including furniture and repairs of same, stationery, printing, ice, purchase and repair of equipment for high-school cadets, and other necessary items not otherwise provided for, including an allowance of not exceeding \$300 per annum for livery of horse or not exceeding \$360 per annum for garage for each the superintendent of schools, the superintendent of janitors, the two assistant superintendents, the director of primary instruction, the school cabinet-maker, the general secretary of community centers, the supervising principal in charge of the white special schools, and the supervising principal of the colored special schools, and including not exceeding \$3,000 for books, books of reference, and periodicals, \$75,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Do I understand that each of the principals here has a garage for the rent of which he is allowed \$30 a month?

Mr. SISSON. Oh, no; not a garage, but where he devotes his horse and buggy or his conveyance to the performance of his duties he is allowed that much for maintenance. That is carried in the bill in other items.

Mr. MADDEN. I wanted to know if they were allowed that much for garage rent.

Mr. SISSON. That simply means gasoline allowance.

The Clerk read as follows:

Hereafter the board of education is authorized to use all necessary floor and room space in the Franklin School building for office purposes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order. What are they going to do with the scholars who will be ousted if they take all of this floor space for offices down there?

Mr. SISSON. They will not do that until they have provided a place for these children. If the gentleman will look at the hearings, he will find that the board of education are simply authorized to do that, and that it is understood they would not change this space until provision had been made.

Mr. WALSH. Apparently they need six additional offices. Are they not furnished accommodations in the District Building?

Mr. SISSON. No official under the school board is in the District Building at all. They are all in this Franklin School. There are but a very few children who attend the Franklin School. As the schools of the District have grown, the number of clerks essential to administering the school districts has also grown, and if the gentleman were to visit the Franklin School he would find they are much crowded now for office space.

Mr. WALSH. I have been there; but I also have a recollection of visiting some school official down here at the District Building.

Mr. SISSON. I can not imagine who that would be.

Mr. WALSH. It might have been the health officer.

Mr. SISSON. It might have been a branch of the purchasing division or the auditor's office.

Mr. WALSH. What is the necessity for six additional offices for the use of the board of education?

Mr. SISSON. The board of education do not need it themselves. They have a board room. That is for the school officials.

Mr. WALSH. Each principal has an office in his own school, has he not?

Mr. SISSON. No. What are called principals in this bill do not always mean principals actually in charge of a school. They may be supervisory principals. The activities of the schools have grown greatly and the number of scholars have perhaps more than doubled since they first went into the Franklin School. Some years ago an effort was made to absorb all of the Franklin School, and at that time I did not believe they needed the space. That is some seven or eight years ago. I prevented its being done; but since the growth of the number of scholars, the number of officials and clerks has necessarily compelled a need for this space. I do not know that they could absorb all of the space within that building within the next current year, but they will take so much of it there will be very little left for teaching space.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman is quite sure that by taking over this space for offices he will not encourage a demand for a new school building in that vicinity to take care of these pupils?

Mr. SISSON. No; it is not contemplated at all.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Appropriations in this act shall not be paid to any person employed under or in connection with the public schools of the District of Columbia who shall solicit or receive, or permit to be solicited or received, on any public-school premises, any subscription or donation of money or other thing of value from pupils enrolled in such public schools for presentation of testimonials to school officials or for any purpose except such as may be authorized by the board of education at a stated meeting upon the written recommendation of the superintendent of schools.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. That is a very peculiar provision of law, and I should like to ask a brief explanation of it.

Mr. SISSON. That has been carried several years.

Mr. TILSON. I note that it is in the current law, and I have wondered at the reason for such a provision as that.

Mr. SISSON. Very serious complaints came to the board of education, and those complaints continued for a number of years before the board of education took it up with the District Commissioners, and they took it up with the subcommittee. Mr. Page was the chairman of the subcommittee at the time, and we had quite extensive hearings upon the kind and character of solicitations made. The gentleman would have been amazed at the number of different kinds and purposes for which subscriptions were taken. The school authorities were caused a great deal of trouble, and upon the urgent recommendation of the board of education and many of the teachers and superintendents, we put that provision in the bill and it worked very well. Of course, this does not prevent the school children from taking up their little subscriptions to buy whatever the school may need in the way of balls and bats and various and sundry things.

Mr. TILSON. I thoroughly approve of the purpose intended to be accomplished, but it seemed to me that might have been accomplished by the board of education itself or by the superintendent of the schools without any legislation.

Mr. SISSON. They doubted their authority to do that without the law, and had not been able to do it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Major and superintendent, \$4,000; 2 assistant superintendents, at \$2,500 each; 3 inspectors, at \$2,000 each; 11 captains, at \$2,000 each; chief clerk, who shall also be property clerk, \$2,000; clerk (who shall be a stenographer), \$1,800; clerk and stenographer, \$1,500; clerks—one (who shall be assistant property clerk) \$1,200, 1 \$1,200, 3 at \$1,000 each, 1 \$700; 4 surgeons of the police and fire departments, at \$840 each; additional compensation for 35 privates detailed for special service in the detection and prevention of crime, \$16,800, or so much thereof as may be necessary; additional compensation for 14 privates detailed for special service in the various precincts for the prevention and detection of crime, at the rate of \$120 per annum, \$1,680, or so much thereof as may be necessary; additional compensation for one inspector or captain and one lieutenant detailed for special service in the detection and prevention of crime, at \$400 each; 20 lieutenants, one of whom shall be harbor master, at \$1,600 each; 54 sergeants, one of whom may be detailed for duty in the harbor patrol, at \$1,400 each; 493 privates of class 1, at \$1,320 each; 86 privates of class 2, at \$1,200 each; 187 privates of class 3, at \$1,080 each; amount required to pay salaries of privates of class 2 who will be promoted to class 3 and privates of class 1 who will be promoted to class 2 during the fiscal year 1920, \$2,000; 8 telephone clerks, at \$900 each; 18 janitors, at \$600 each; laborer, \$720; messenger \$600; inspector, mounted on horse or motor vehicle, \$360; 58 captains, lieutenants, sergeants, and privates, mounted on horses or for motor vehicle allowances, at \$360 each; 64 lieutenants, sergeants, and privates, mounted on bicycles, at \$60 each; 35 drivers, at \$900 each; 5 police matrons, at \$720 each, to possess police powers of arrest; 4 policewomen, at \$900 each; in all, \$1,219,600.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. How many policemen of all grades have they now in the District?

Mr. SISSON. They have seven hundred and sixty-six privates.

Mr. MADDEN. The number has not been increased at all the last few years, has it?

Mr. SISSON. Oh, yes.

Mr. MADDEN. How much?

Mr. SISSON. We gave them all they asked for last year. They have enough now to man all the police stations now in the District. It takes a certain number of policemen to each station.

Mr. MADDEN. I know, but it is not a question of manning the police stations; it is a question of patrolling the territory.

Mr. SISSON. That is true; but the police stations are presumed to take care of the territory and have been so arranged. I do not believe this last police station has been put in operation; if so, very lately, because they were unable to get the men after the war broke out, and the police force is considerably short now. Just what number I am unable to inform the gentleman, but something like 80, 90, or 100 policemen.

Mr. MADDEN. And less men on the force than authorized?

Mr. SISSON. Yes. They have been unable to get them.

Mr. MADDEN. I see they have been using military police.

Mr. SISSON. They supplied the deficit by having enough soldiers detailed to take the place of the policemen they were unable to get; they actually detailed soldiers to do police duty.

Mr. MADDEN. I notice laborers under this provision of the bill get only \$720 a year. Now, laborers in other departments of the Government get anywhere from \$840 to \$900.

Mr. SISSON. Well, most of them outside of the Postal Service get \$660 to \$720. These laborers are rather caretakers of the police station.

Mr. MADDEN. There are janitors there who do that. A caretaker is a janitor.

Mr. SISSON. He is a janitor, but they have some little assistant laborers; some of those are rather old men.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the gentleman state a laborer is an assistant to a janitor?

Mr. SISSON. In many cases.

Mr. MADDEN. Then a laborer gets \$120 more a year than a janitor, and he is surely not an assistant to the janitor?

Mr. SISSON. The laborer that they use here in this is really where it is a little work about the police station to keep the police station in order. The janitor looks after the heating, fire, and sweeps the floor.

Mr. MADDEN. Tell me that over again; I do not get that.

Mr. SISSON. The laborer there is a man who, when a little something is out of order, does work around the police station, such as a little carpenter work; a little work around the police station to keep it in order.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the matter with Gompers and his crowd? Are they going to turn out the carpenters working around the stations?

Mr. SISSON. I am not trying to raise any more trouble along that line than I can, and I hope the gentleman will not.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SISSON. I will.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman referred to details of soldiers to act as policemen. I suppose we have all noticed some of them acting as crossing policemen. How is that done?

Mr. SISSON. That I can not tell the gentleman because I know nothing absolutely how it is done. I know nothing about what power did it; but my understanding is, of course, that they were furloughed to do this duty, but by what authority I can not tell; but those men, as a rule, I understand—and this is not by any knowledge or investigation but an understanding I have about it—many of them were men in limited service and they were furloughed, and, I will not state this positively, I understand they did not get their salaries as soldiers while they were on furlough but perhaps drew their salary as policemen.

Mr. MANN. They are paid as policemen in the District?

Mr. SISSON. They are paid as policemen, as I understand it.

Mr. MANN. And not required to wear a policeman's uniform?

Mr. SISSON. No; they wear, as I saw them on the street, a soldier's uniform.

Mr. MADDEN. Military police?

Mr. SISSON. Marked "Military police."

Mr. MANN. That is what I am trying to get at. I do not quite understand how a soldier is furloughed from the Army and employed by the District Commissioners as a military policeman.

Mr. SISSON. I can not give the gentleman any information.

Mr. MANN. There is no such information drawn out by the subcommittee?

Mr. SISSON. No, sir.

Mr. GARD. If the gentleman will yield, I will say that this morning I also saw a man in military uniform delivering mail, attached to the city post office.

Mr. MANN. As I understand, a man in the Army may have resigned and he is entitled to wear his uniform a certain length of time and he may be employed as a letter carrier or may have been a letter carrier restored.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

FIRE DEPARTMENT.

Chief engineer, \$3,500; 2 deputy chief engineers, at \$2,500 each; 8 battalion chief engineers, at \$2,000 each; fire marshal, \$2,000; deputy fire marshal, \$1,400; 4 inspectors, at \$1,080 each; chief clerk, \$2,000; clerk, \$1,400; clerk (who shall be a stenographer and typewriter), \$1,400; 38 captains, at \$1,500 each; 40 lieutenants, at \$1,320 each; 41 sergeants, at \$1,200 each; superintendent of machinery, \$2,000; assistant superintendent of machinery, \$1,200; 27 engineers, at \$1,200 each; 27 assistant engineers, at \$1,140 each; 2 pilots, at \$1,150 each; 2 marine engineers, at \$1,200 each; 2 assistant marine engineers, at \$1,140 each; 2 marine firemen, at \$840 each; 342 privates of class 2, at \$1,140 each; 103 privates of class 1, at \$960 each; hostler, \$600; laborer, \$600; in all, \$761,020.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I understand that this is the first year that the two-platoon system has been in operation in the Fire Department of the District of Columbia. Am I correct?

Mr. SISSON. Yes; this is the first time.

Mr. DALLINGER. I am very much interested in that system and in favor of it on general principles, and I simply wanted to ask the gentleman from Mississippi in charge of this bill what the additional expense of the double-platoon system was in the District this last year?

Mr. SISSON. About 30 per cent in round numbers. This last year, however, is not fair—well it is fair in its expenditure, but not a fair test of the system, because they suffered the same inconvenience in reference to getting firemen that they had in getting policemen. Many firemen were of draft age, and I have now forgotten, but quite a large number of them were taken into the Army, and they had great difficulty in getting young men who were active and strong to stand the examination, and by the way, it is one of the most rigid examinations of any examination, and I do not think they have been able up to date to do much with the two-platoon system, but they will begin now to put it into operation before the close of the year.

Mr. DALLINGER. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For enforcement of the provisions of an act to prevent the spread of contagious diseases in the District of Columbia, approved March 3, 1897, and an act for the prevention of scarlet fever, diphtheria, measles, whooping cough, chicken pox, epidemic cerebrospinal meningitis, and typhoid fever in the District of Columbia, approved February 9, 1907, and an act to provide for registration of all cases of tuberculosis in the District of Columbia, for free examination of sputum in suspected cases, and for preventing the spread of tuberculosis in said District of Columbia, approved May 13, 1908, under the direction of the health officer of said District, manufacture of serums, including their use in indigent cases, and for the prevention of infantile paralysis and other communicable diseases, including salaries or compensation for personal services, not exceeding \$25,000, when ordered in writing by the commissioners and necessary for the enforcement and execution of said acts, and for the prevention of such other communicable diseases as hereinbefore provided, purchase and maintenance of necessary horses, wagons, and harness, purchase of reference books and medical journals, and maintenance of quarantine station and smallpox hospital, \$40,000: *Provided*, That any bacteriologist employed under this appropriation shall not be paid more than \$7 per day and may be assigned by the health officer to the bacteriological examination of milk and other dairy products and of the water supplies of dairy farms, and to such other sanitary work as in the judgment of the health officer will promote the public health, whether such examinations be or be not directly related to contagious diseases.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, does not the gentleman in charge of the bill think, in view of the experience of this city and the rest of the country during the last few months, that he ought to include influenza in the list of communicable diseases that ought to be provided against?

Mr. SISSON. I will state frankly to the gentleman from Connecticut that the subject has not come to us; but the gentleman will notice, after enumerating diseases, the language is broad enough to cover other communicable diseases, and they did, by the way, take steps in reference to influenza here under this very act.

Mr. TILSON. They construed the act as being broad enough to cover it, although it is not specifically mentioned in the act itself?

Mr. SISSON. Yes. You will notice down there it says "infantile paralysis and other communicable diseases," and under that head, if it is an infectious or contagious disease, they construe that language to be broad enough.

The Clerk read as follows:

Juvenile court: Judge, \$3,600; clerk, \$2,000; deputy clerk, who is authorized to act as clerk in the absence of that officer, \$1,480; financial clerk, who is authorized to act as deputy clerk, \$1,200; stenographer and typewriter, who is authorized to act as a deputy clerk, \$1,080; stenographer and typewriter for judge's work, and to aid in keeping records in clerk's office, \$1,080; probation officers—chief, \$1,800; assistant chief (who shall also be investigating officer for children's cases), \$1,500, 2 at \$1,200 each, 1 for adult cases \$1,200, 4 at \$1,000 each; investigating officer for adult cases, \$1,200; record and information clerk for probation office, \$1,200; clerk for probation office, \$900; 2 bailiffs, at \$900 each; telephone operator, \$600; messenger, \$600; janitor, \$600; charwoman, \$240; in all, \$28,480.

Mr. MANN. The spelling of the word "bailiffs" should be corrected.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the correction of the spelling of the word "bailiffs" will be changed to "bailiffs."

There was no objection.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the subcommittee if he knows what has become of the bill for the creation of a new juvenile-court code that we worked on here some time ago and which evidently was very badly needed in the District of Columbia?

Mr. SISSON. I know it passed the House, but I do not know whether it passed the Senate or not.

Mr. MADDEN. Did it not pass the Senate?

Mr. SISSON. The only thing I know of is that it passed the House, but I do not know whether it passed the Senate or not.

The Clerk read as follows:

Police court: Two judges, at \$3,000 each; clerk, \$2,200; deputy clerk—one \$1,600, two \$1,500, two at \$1,200 each; deputy financial clerk, \$1,500; deputy assistant financial clerk, \$1,500; probation officer, \$1,500; two assistant probation officers, at \$1,200 each; seven bailiffs, at \$900 each; deputy marshal, \$1,000; janitor, \$900; engineer, \$900; assistant engineer, \$720; firemen, \$600; assistant janitor, \$300; matron, \$600; four cleaners, at \$360 each; telephone operator, \$480; in all, \$36,240.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. What do they do with deputy marshals in a police court? Is not that a Government office?

Mr. Sisson. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Is that under the marshal of the District of Columbia?

Mr. Sisson. Yes. They call them all marshals.

Mr. MADDEN. Bailiffs, I thought they had.

Mr. Sisson. They do have a bailiff and a marshal.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the difference between a bailiff and a marshal?

Mr. Sisson. I do not know that I could tell the gentleman exactly what the difference is. The bailiff waits on the court, is a sort of a court crier, and the marshal goes out and serves papers and arrests people.

Mr. MADDEN. The bailiff does that.

Mr. Sisson. I do not think the bailiff in the District of Columbia is that sort of a fellow. I think he sits around and waits on the court and on the jury and performs functions of that kind.

Mr. MADDEN. And renders the decisions of the court, and things like that?

Mr. Sisson. Well, I do not know that he does that. Some of them may think they are able to do that, but I do not know that the judges have resigned their functions to them yet.

Mr. MADDEN. How many marshals have we?

Mr. Sisson. That I can not tell the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. We have a deputy marshal here. Do we have a chief marshal?

Mr. Sisson. This is a regular marshal of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MADDEN. Is that marshal in the police court an employee of the marshal of the District?

Mr. Sisson. He is under his supervision, but I am not absolutely sure whether he is appointed by the marshal or not. I believe he is, however, appointed by the marshal. I have not investigated the method of appointment. Of course, the marshal is appointed by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate.

Mr. MADDEN. Of course, if he is appointed by the marshal he ought to be appropriated for through the marshal's office.

Mr. Sisson. Each court's expenses are kept separately. It would be impossible to keep up with the expenses of the courts unless each court was able to control its own items of expense.

Mr. MADDEN. What is the difference between the expense of the police court and its receipts?

Mr. Sisson. That I can not tell. I did not make any inquiry about that, nor did any member of the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

EMERGENCY FUND.

To be expended only in case of emergency, such as riot, pestilence, public insanitary conditions, calamity by flood or fire or storm, and of like character, and in all cases of emergency not otherwise sufficiently provided for, in the discretion of the commissioners, \$8,000: *Provided*, That in the purchase of all articles provided for in this act no more than the market price shall be paid for any such articles, and all bids for any such articles above the market price shall be rejected and new bids received or purchases made in open market, as may be most economical and advantageous to the District of Columbia.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois reserves a point of order on the proviso.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi if he can explain what this proviso means?

Mr. Sisson. I will state to the gentleman that that proviso has been in the bill for some time.

Mr. MADDEN. I read: "That in the purchase of all articles provided for in this act no more than the market price shall be paid for any such articles, and all bids for any such articles above the market price shall be rejected and new bids received or purchases made in open market." Who is going to tell what the market price is?

Mr. Sisson. The commissioners themselves.

Mr. MADDEN. How do they know? The market price keeps changing every 15 minutes. It is a funny kind of proviso.

Mr. Sisson. It has been carried for a number of years.

Mr. MADDEN. I think it is subject to a point of order. I will make the point of order on it.

Mr. Sisson. It was in the bill even when my friend was a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. MADDEN. That does not make it right.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Foster). Is there a law that provides for these purchases?

Mr. Sisson. This is a pure limitation on the expenditure of the \$8,000. There is no absolutely permanent law; nothing except the limitation upon the expenditure of the \$8,000.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman thinks it is a wise provision?

Mr. Sisson. I do; yes.

Mr. MADDEN. It does not seem to me to be susceptible of intelligent administration.

Mr. Sisson. There are a great many small articles, as the gentleman knows, for which you can not advertise, and in the purchase of these articles this is simply a protection to the Treasury. These gentlemen are charged with the duty of knowing what these things are worth in the market, and they are not authorized to expend this money for any article where the price asked is greater than the market price. I do not know the history of how it got into the bill, except that it went on long before I came to Congress.

Mr. MADDEN. They have the power to refuse to buy.

Mr. Sisson. I thought perhaps the gentleman himself might explain it to me, because it went on when he was a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. MADDEN. It is so badly written that perhaps I may have written it myself. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw the point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. I will withdraw it because the gentleman from Mississippi smiles so sweetly. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COURTS AND PRISONS.

Support of convicts: For support, maintenance, and transportation of convicts transferred from the District of Columbia; expenses of shipping remains of deceased convicts to their homes in the United States; and expenses of interment of unclaimed remains of deceased convicts; expenses incurred in identifying and pursuing escaped convicts and rewards for their recapture; to be expended under the direction of the Attorney General, \$100,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. MADDEN. I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi how much of this \$100,000 is for support, maintenance, and transportation of convicts transferred from the District of Columbia, how much is for expenses of shipping the remains of deceased convicts to their homes in the United States and expenses of interment of unclaimed remains of deceased convicts, and how much is for expenses incurred in identifying and pursuing escaped convicts and rewards for their capture?

Mr. Sisson. It is not itemized in our hearings.

Mr. MADDEN. I thought maybe the gentleman from Mississippi would know, since the committee raised the appropriation from \$55,000 to \$100,000. I thought the committee would have some reason for adding the \$45,000 to the former appropriation.

Mr. Sisson. Originally \$110,000 was appropriated in the bill for 1918, and they had a deficiency of \$10,000. It was contemplated at one time that all of these prisoners should be sent to Occoquan, but some of these judges have not sent them there.

Mr. MADDEN. They could not send a man to Occoquan if he were found guilty of a felony. That is merely a Bridewell, as I understand, for misdemeanors.

Mr. Sisson. No. They have a good many life-term men down at Occoquan. But the arrangement was made by the judges because the accommodations were not then sufficient at Occoquan, and are not sufficient now to keep these prisoners, and the judges have continued to send them to Fort Leavenworth and Atlanta. That accounts for the small amount asked for and appropriated for 1919; but there will be a considerable addition to what has been asked for. The gentleman understands that the current law carries \$55,000.

Mr. MADDEN. That is what I said.

Mr. Sisson. The bill for 1919 carried \$110,000 and \$10,000 deficiency. Most of this is for the maintenance of our prisoners by a contract with the Atlanta Penitentiary, where we pay the cost of the maintenance of the prisoners.

Mr. MADDEN. Do we not send some of these prisoners to the State of Virginia and the State of Maryland?

Mr. Sisson. I do not think so.

Mr. MADDEN. We used to.

Mr. Sisson. I think perhaps we formerly did, but I do not think any of them go there now. At a time when the penitentiaries could not accommodate them the judges would send

the prisoners to some State prison where it was convenient, but I do not think they do now.

Mr. MADDEN. Does not this largely increased appropriation indicate a greater amount of crime in the last year than formerly?

Mr. Sisson. No. Nothing can be reflected in this increased appropriation over that carried in the current year, because under the current year it was understood that improvements would be made at Occoquan to take care of the prisoners there. But when the war came on there was difficulty in getting material—not labor, because the prisoners themselves do most of the labor, except supervisory labor.

Mr. MADDEN. They make brick down there, do they not?

Mr. Sisson. Yes; the brickyard has been running, and I understand a great amount of the brick have been absorbed here in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MADDEN. They thought it was more profitable to sell the brick at fabulous prices, did they?

Mr. Sisson. They needed the brick for District purposes, and under the provision of the law they were not permitted to sell brick in the open market.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman tell the committee where they used any brick in the District of Columbia in the last year, except to build about 10 houses?

Mr. Sisson. I can not tell the gentleman.

Mr. MADDEN. There was not any brick used.

Mr. Sisson. The Government has used some brick. I do not know how these brick were finally disposed of.

Mr. MADDEN. There was no brick used here.

Mr. Sisson. They furnished most of the brick for the Central High School, but that was completed sometime ago.

Mr. MADDEN. Was that built this year?

Mr. Sisson. No; I say that was finished sometime ago. I do not know that all the work at the Central High School has absolutely been completed yet, but, of course, the building has been completed. I think they did some work there this year, but how much I can not tell.

Mr. MADDEN. That was plastering and interior work, wasn't it?

Mr. Sisson. I think they used some brick there, too, but how much I can not tell.

Mr. MADDEN. So that the gentleman can not tell whether this is on account of increased crime?

Mr. Sisson. Of course, all of our maintenance has increased greatly within the last year, on account of the great increase in the cost of living and food supply.

Mr. MADDEN. Let me ask the gentleman, Do the prisoners at Occoquan raise their own food supply?

Mr. Sisson. Yes; in so far as they can. You know they went down into a wilderness there.

Mr. MADDEN. How much land does the Government own there?

Mr. Sisson. I think they bought originally 1,100 acres, but they have added perhaps 900 or 1,000 acres since they carried the reformatory down there. They have both institutions there now.

Mr. MADDEN. Another thing. How many prisoners have we there?

Mr. Sisson. I think in both institutions in the neighborhood of about 400 or 500. We inquired into that, but my recollection is not very distinct.

Mr. MADDEN. Enough prisoners to work all these 2,000 acres of land?

Mr. Sisson. I think so. They have an orchard there, I understand, which of course does not require a great deal of work.

Mr. MADDEN. On the 2,000 acres of land do they raise food enough to feed all the 500 prisoners?

Mr. Sisson. If it was fertile land they would certainly raise more than enough.

Mr. MADDEN. How much do they raise?

Mr. Sisson. I do not know exactly.

Mr. MADDEN. How much of a deficit is there in the operation of the institution every year?

Mr. Sisson. This money is covered into the Treasury when the products are sold, and there is a very accurate accounting taken, and Mr. Tweedale, I think, made a statement to the committee. I am not certain whether it went into the Record or not. I asked him to make a statement, and I think he made a statement covering the itemized expenditures and the itemized income. Of course, we could not tell just what that was this year, because it is in the middle of the year.

Mr. MADDEN. Who is Mr. Tweedale?

Mr. Sisson. He is the auditor of the District of Columbia. I ought to have called him the auditor.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MADDEN. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi may have two minutes in which to answer the question.

Mr. Sisson. I do not know that I will take the two minutes. If the gentleman will look in the report of the Board of Charities, he will find the information from 1911 down to 1918. In 1918, \$22,182 was credited; in 1907, \$37,180 was credited; in 1916, \$15,244, and so on.

Mr. MADDEN. Credited to what?

Mr. Sisson. Paid into the Treasury.

Mr. MADDEN. And that is all the money that was paid in out of this whole institution?

Mr. Sisson. The gentleman will understand that they are completing their buildings, clearing up the land and improving it, pulling up stumps, and so on. In other words, they went down there into the wilderness without a stick of mint. They took that land which was absolutely wild, and they have been improving it. It is quite an institution. In my judgment, it is going to pay the expenses of the convicts when it is put into cultivation. I think the management is extremely good.

Mr. MADDEN. I am very much obliged to the gentleman. I think we have reached a very important point in the consideration of the bill, and we have worked pretty hard this afternoon, and I see there are not a great many Members present.

Mr. Sisson. I hope the gentleman will not cut us off at this time.

Mr. MADDEN. I think it is about time.

Mr. MANN. We can not finish the bill to-night. There are 30 more pages.

Mr. MADDEN. I suggest that the gentleman accommodate himself to the situation.

Mr. Sisson. Let us run 30 minutes longer. I think the last inquiries made by the gentleman from Illinois were not for information very much desired.

Mr. MADDEN. It was interesting and valuable. I do not know of anyone else who could have supplied it as intelligently as the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. Sisson. Of course, if there was a quorum here I might insist upon going on, but I am helpless without a quorum.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FOSTER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 13277, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business of Calendar Wednesday to-morrow may be dispensed with and that the pending bill be made a special order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent that the business on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with to-morrow and the pending bill be made a special order. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, as far as I am concerned, I would have no objection in the morning to dispensing with Calendar Wednesday, but I do not think it is a very good practice with the small membership we have at present to make the request when there might be Members who have matters that they wish to call up. In other words, I do not think we ought to get into the position, which we are getting into, of leaving everything to be considered by a report from the Committee on Rules. Later in the session we will have to dispense with Calendar Wednesday nearly all the time.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, what committee has the call to-morrow?

The SPEAKER. The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Mr. MOON. The Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads has a bill on the calendar already reported.

Mr. MANN. An appropriation bill would not be in order to-morrow.

Mr. MOON. I want to ask whether there is any order fixed for the consideration of the judicial salary bill. I doubt the propriety of putting that ahead of the Post Office bill. I am willing to pass over Calendar Wednesday if we can come in after the District bill.

Mr. GARD. There was a rule of that kind, I think.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. MANN. For to-night I object.

COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL SECURITY LEAGUE.

The SPEAKER appointed Mr. BROWNE of Wisconsin in place of Mr. TOWNER of Iowa as a member of the committee.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. Sisson. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 11, 1918, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from The Adjutant General of the Army, together with report showing distribution of official documents, regulations, manuals, publications, etc., pertaining to the War Department, made during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1571); to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, inviting attention to items in the estimates of appropriations for the Light-house Service for the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 1572); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the commissioner of Freedman's Savings & Trust Co., transmitting annual report of the Freedman's Savings & Trust Co. for the year ended December 1, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1573); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the twenty-eighth annual report of the Board of Ordnance and Fortifications covering the fiscal year from July 1, 1917, to June 30, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1423); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. SHERLEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 13261) providing for the transportation from the District of Columbia of governmental employees whose services are no longer required, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 850), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of the Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12839) granting a pension to Bronislaw Wypiewski; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 11561) granting an increase of pension to Patrick M. Droney; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 10693) granting an increase of pension to Tony K. Wilson; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 11024) granting an increase of pension to Abel B. Conger; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 12475) granting an increase of pension to John Weiss; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 11002) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Faris; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 13006) granting an increase of pension to Tillie Wester; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 12367) granting a pension to Patrick Lehan; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7248) granting a pension to Eliza Greten; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 12398) granting a pension to Henry Simpson; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 13320) appropriating money for the improvement of the Shrewsbury River, N. J., up to Red Bank, on the North Branch, and to Branchport, on the South Branch; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. DAVIS: A bill (H. R. 13321) providing for the local commemoration in the city of Hutchinson, county of McLeod, State of Minnesota, of the soldiers, sailors, marines, and aviators who lost their lives and participated in the service of the United States during the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 13322) making provision for the construction of a canal across the State of New Jersey to connect the Delaware River with New York Harbor; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13323) appropriating money for the improvement of the Raritan River, N. J.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SIMS: A bill (H. R. 13324) to provide transportation, storage, and marketing facilities for and to regulate commerce among the States in live stock, meats, and other products derived from live stock or the slaughtering of live stock; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LUFKIN: A bill (H. R. 13325) to suspend immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 13326) to provide relief for commissioned officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted persons in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and the Army Nurse Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 13327) to provide for the retention of all uniforms issued to soldiers and sailors of the United States who have been honorably discharged, and providing also for privilege of using same, and for one month's extra pay upon being discharged, and authorizing War and Navy Departments to sell at cost surplus clothing and supplies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 13328) to provide for the retention of all uniforms issued to soldiers, sailors, and marines and providing also for the use of same; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOON: Resolution (H. Res. 475) providing for the consideration of House bill 13308, Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on Rules.

By Miss RANKIN: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 363) proposing recognition by the Congress of the United States of the right of Irish independence, and requesting the commissioners plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the international peace conference to present to the conference the right of Ireland to freedom, independence, and self-determination; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLOOD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 364) authorizing the appointment of an ambassador to the Republic of Peru; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 13329) granting a pension to Catharine Rodgers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURROUGHS: A bill (H. R. 13330) granting an increase of pension to Silas H. Avery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13331) granting an increase of pension to John H. Bartlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 13332) granting a pension to Nancy E. Mullins; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 13333) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint Charles A. Ranlett major of Infantry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. IGOE: A bill (H. R. 13334) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Christy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13335) granting an increase of pension to Maria Kuehn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: A bill (H. R. 13336) granting a pension to Charles Michener; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 13337) granting an increase of pension to David Kimball; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 13338) granting a pension to Nancy M. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BURROUGHS: Petition urging that the same consideration be given to Ireland as to all other small nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CRAGO: Resolution and suggestions of the Philadelphia Bourse for the upbuilding of an American merchant marine; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petition of the San Francisco Labor Council, in meeting assembled, indorsing and recommending the McKellar-Keating bill, known as S. 4637 and H. R. 12352; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. ESCH: Resolution of the San Francisco Labor Council indorsing and recommending the McKellar-Keating bill, known in the Senate as S. 4637 and in the House of Representatives as H. R. 12352; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Memorial of the board of education of the Ottawa (Ill.) Township High School favoring Senate bill 4987, for the establishment of a department of education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition urging construction of Government-owned public highways throughout the United States; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Resolution of the faculty of the Maryland State Normal School, Towson, Md., heartily indorsing Senate bill 4987, for equalizing educational opportunities, for promotion of physical and health education, and for preparing teachers for schools; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. RAKER: Resolution by the City Council of Los Angeles, Cal., providing that the American Expeditionary Forces shall march through the city of Berlin and embark at a German port; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution by Friday Morning Club of Los Angeles, Cal., petitioning Congress to pass Senate bill 4987, which provides for the establishment of a department of education coordinate with other departments of the Government; to the Committee on Education.

Also, protest by the Writers' Club of San Diego, Cal., against the proposed zone amendment to postal law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution by the San Francisco Center of the California Civic League, providing for the appointment of women on the peace council at the close of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution by city council of the city of Los Angeles, Cal., indorsing a certain bill before Congress prohibiting the public or private display of certain flags or emblems; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution by the West Coast Lumbermen's Association, requesting Congress to amend the revenue laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution relative to the construction of a bridge across the Golden Gate by the Federal Government, submitted by the clerk of the board of supervisors of the city and county of San Francisco, Cal.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Principals' Club of the Los Angeles city schools, petitioning Congress to pass Senate bill 4987; to the Committee on Education.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, December 11, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come before Thee day by day for the daily tasks of life. The most common drudgery is made glorious by Thy blessing, and the high tasks of this great office call for the constant support and guidance of the loving Father in heaven. Let Thy blessing rest upon Thy servants this day in the discharge of the duties that are upon them. May they realize that they are working together with God for the accomplishment of a great ideal. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

CONGRATULATIONS OF BRAZILIAN SENATE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate congratulations of the Brazilian Senate on the successful conclusion of the war, which will be read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The congratulations are as follows:

The PRESIDENT OF THE NORTH AMERICAN SENATE:

Washington:

I take pleasure in informing your excellency that the Brazilian Senate, after hearing read the Government's communication of the signing yesterday of the armistice granted by the allies to Germany, resolved, on motion of Senator Ruy Barboza, amidst boisterous applause and by unanimous vote of its members, to suspend to-day's session as a sign of exultation at the victory of the European allied arms and those of North America, the duty falling upon me to address the governments and senates of the allied countries expressing the sentiments of unmeasured jubilation and indescribable pride with which the Brazilian Senate and Nation received those conjectured victories which for democracy and for human liberties for four years have been gloriously fought in the fields of Europe.

Very respectfully,

ANTONIO AZEVEDO,
President of the Senate.

CONGRATULATIONS OF SPANISH SENATE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a translation of a note of the Spanish Ambassador announcing that the Spanish Senate had directed to be entered on its journal congratulations on the triumph of justice over force, which will be read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, December 7, 1918.

The Hon. THOMAS R. MARSHALL,

Vice President of the United States.

SIR: At the request of the Spanish Ambassador at this Capital, in accordance with the instructions of his Government, I have the honor to inclose for the information of the Senate a translation of a note from the ambassador announcing that the Spanish Senate unanimously directed to be entered on its journal, in view of the signing of the armistice of November 11, 1918, congratulations on the peace and the triumph of justice over force.

I have the honor to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

FRANK L. POLK,
Acting Secretary of State.

EMBASSY OF SPAIN,
Washington, November 15, 1918.

The Hon. ROBERT LANSING,

Secretary of State of the United States.

Mr. SECRETARY: By order of my Government and with the request that you kindly make the fact known to the American Houses of Congress, I have the honor to inform you that at the session of the Spanish Senate Señor Gimeno, former minister of state, delivered a brilliant speech eulogizing peace and dedicating effusive words to all and each of the allied countries. After a short debate, the Senate unanimously ordered to be entered into the journal that it congratulates itself on the peace and triumph of justice over strength.

I avail myself, etc.,

JUAN RIANO.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, if I may say a single word in connection with the letters of congratulation which have just been presented and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, we had some similar letters referred to the committee, and the committee unanimously reported a resolution which the Senate adopted, requesting the Vice President to respond in the name of the Senate and acknowledge the resolutions. It seems to me it is hardly necessary to go through that form again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair states to the Senator from Massachusetts that he construed the resolution as applicable to all subsequently received, and so has answered them all in a congratulatory way.

Mr. LODGE. So I supposed.

SENATOR FROM NEW JERSEY.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the credentials of Walter E. Edge, Senator elect from the State of New Jersey, which will be considered read, printed in the Record, and placed on the file.

The credentials are as follows:

STATE OF NEW JERSEY:

I, Thomas F. McGran, president of the senate, acting governor of the State of New Jersey, do hereby certify that at an election held in the said State on the 5th day of November, 1918, Walter E. Edge was duly